



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Gen. Wks
Intro's

474-1860

475 1861-

B3 475-85
B7.

**A GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO
THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE**

A GENERAL
INTRODUCTION
TO THE STUDY OF
HOLY SCRIPTURE

BY
A. E. BREEN, Ph. D., D. D.

*Πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν,
πρὸς ἔλεγχον, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν, πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν
δικαιοσύνῃ. Ἵνα ἄρτιος ᾖ ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος
πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτισμένος.*

SECOND EDITION
REVISED AND ENLARGED

ROCHESTER, N. Y.
JOHN P. SMITH PRINTING COMPANY
1908

52599231

Nihil obstat
J. Emil Gefelle Ph.D.
Censor Deputatus.

LOAN STACK

Imprimatur .

Bernard;
Bishop of Rochester

Rochester, N. Y., February 1, 1908.

8222C

B5475

B7

1908

Preface to the Second Edition.

We live in an age of great activity. It is also an age wherein material progress and the love of worldly pleasure tend to enfeeble man's hold on the supernatural world. It is most evident that there is a general movement away from the spiritual world. In non-Catholic thought the idea of a *reduced* Christianity is dominant. A mere natural religion recommends itself to many. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them because they are spiritually examined." [I. Cor. II. 14.] Instead of accepting religion as a mysterious message from Heaven, men make a religion that is not religious. A religion is sought that will not interfere with man's worldly tastes and pleasures. Human reason is made the judge of all the works of God. Arianism is recrudescant under another name and formula. The mystery of Christ's Divinity, the miracles of the Bible, the extraordinary action of God in the Revelation and Inspiration of the Scriptures are made the special objects of attack in this modern fashion of thought.

That which is most deplorable is that this tendency has in some degree invaded the minds of some Catholic scholars. Clear calls of warning come from Christ's Vicar; the danger is grave. The demon of unbelief finds strong allies in the pride and rebellion of fallen human nature.

During the last twenty-five years the Church has waged a fierce battle in defense of the Holy Scriptures. In this fight her worst enemies are those of her own children, who, making dishonorable compromises with the Rationalists, the "true children and inheritors of the older heretics," make a breach in the walls which they have sworn to defend.

General Introduction teaches the art of studying Holy Scripture:

“Vie più che indarno da riva si parte,
Perchè non torna tal qual ei si muove,
Chi pesca per lo vero e non ha l'arte.”

The study of Holy Scripture is proposed in that remarkable encyclical, “Providentissimus Deus,” as the chief remedy against the evil doctrinal tendencies of our time. This study cannot be pursued without a competent knowledge of the questions which an Introduction to Holy Scripture treats. The very key to the present situation is a right idea of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Hence in this Second Edition of my work, I have devoted about one third of the volume to this great theme. I have endeavored in all things to be conservative. I have endeavored to present a fair examination of the different theories, and in judging of them, the authority of the Church has been the norm. My treatise on the Canon of the Old Testament may be judged excessively long, but I have contemplated this as a work of reference, in which completeness of treatment is required. My hope is that I may have, in some small degree, helped the Cause of Christ.

A. E. BREEN.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.,

Feast of the Circumcision of Our Lord, 1908.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. REVELATION AND ITS CRITERION - - - - -	1
II. EXTENT OF INSPIRATION - - - - -	198
III. THE CANON - - - - -	239
IV. THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT - - - - -	240
V. EZRA AND HIS INFLUENCE - - - - -	246
VI. THE ALEXANDRIAN CANON - - - - -	259
VII. THE CANON OF THE CHURCH - - - - -	263
VIII. THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT OF THE FOURTH CENTURY - - - - -	360
IX. THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FROM THE END OF THE FIFTH CENTURY TO THE BEGINNING OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY - - - - -	466
X. THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY TO THE COUNCIL OF TRENT - - - - -	502
XI. THE COUNCIL OF TRENT - - - - -	516
XII. THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT - - - - -	529
XIII. THE NEW TESTAMENT OF THE SECTS - - - - -	605
XIV. THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS OF BOTH TESTAMENTS - - - - -	606
XV. THE LOST BOOKS OF BOTH TESTAMENTS - - - - -	623
XVI. THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT - - - - -	625
XVII. THE GREEK TEXT - - - - -	642
XVIII. THE UNCIAL CODICES - - - - -	663
XIX. THE SEPTUAGINT AND OTHER GREEK VERSIONS - - - - -	686
XX. VERSIONS DERIVED FROM THE SEPTUAGINT - - - - -	698
XXI. THE TARGUMS - - - - -	705
XXII. THE ANCIENT VERSIONS - - - - -	707
XXIII. THE VULGATE - - - - -	726
XXIV. THE AUTHORIZATION OF THE LATIN VULGATE - - - - -	729
XXV. THE CORRECTION OF THE VULGATE - - - - -	754
XXVI. THE ENGLISH VERSIONS - - - - -	766
XXVII. THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE - - - - -	779
XXVIII. JEWISH INTERPRETATION - - - - -	795
INDEX - - - - -	805

A General Introduction to Holy Scripture.

CHAPTER I.

REVELATION AND ITS CRITERION.

The science of Introduction to Holy Scripture has for its object to treat of the Books of Inspired Scripture, their Number, the Nature of Inspiration, the Authenticity of the several books, the Canon, the ancient Codices, the Versions of Holy Scripture, the History of the Text, the Decrees of the Church regarding the Holy Books and the Laws of Expounding Holy Scripture.

The existence of inspired writings is a fact warranted by the most convincing data. The tradition of the Jews, the approbation of Christ, the traditions of Christians, the sublimity of the writings, the verification of prophecies, and the universal belief of civilized mankind are alone natural motives of credibility which logically produce certainty. Moreover, those who are incorporated in the organized economy of the New Law have the living voice of the Holy Ghost, declaring through the Church: "*And this supernatural revelation, according to the faith of the universal Church, declared in the Holy Tridentine Synod, is contained in the written books and unwritten traditions, which have come down to us.*" [Vat. Council, Cap. II. De Revelatione.]

The existence of divinely inspired Scripture is so essentially bound up with the existence of religion itself that they stand or fall together. Ancient history and modern history make the existence of an authentic written message from

God to man a necessity. The writers of the Old Law abundantly proved by miracles the divine commission to deliver in writing the message of God. The great revelation of God through Christ added certainty to certainty; and Christianity continues through the ages to present the proofs of the divinity of the Holy Books. No man will deny that the Christian religion is a fact; and were there no divinely inspired Scriptures, that fact would not have a sufficient cause. The Christian Church draws her life from two fountains, the Holy Scriptures and the living voice of the Holy Ghost within her. Had it so pleased God he could have founded, and could have conserved religion without any written message. However, considering the nature of man, it seems more conformable to the wisdom of God to deliver to man a written deposit which should be an everlasting memorial of God's teachings. Moreover, religion claims to possess divine Scriptures; the Jews received their Scriptures from Moses and the Prophets, and handed them down to the Christian Church. Jesus Christ appealed to these Scriptures as the infallible message of God; all the writers of the New Testament corroborate the doctrine of the existence of divinely inspired Scriptures. Hence to deny the existence of inspired Books is tantamount to deny that religion exists.

Having once placed as a basic position that there exist divinely inspired writings, the next step is to determine how we may infallibly discern and know what is inspired and what is not. We must establish an adequate criterion, which can discriminate, from all other books, the products of the authorship of God.

Inspiration, in its formal concept, is a supernatural psychological effect, wrought in the mind of the inspired agent by the First Cause. We might define it, using the conciseness and precision of the Latin idiom: *Illustratio mentis et motus efficax voluntatis a Deo, ad exprimendum infallibiliter sensum Dei, seu ad exprimenda ea omnia et sola quae Deus vult.* Now it is plainly evident that a fact of such nature can be immediately known but to two beings, God and the person inspired.

It must be conceded that many of the inspired writers were conscious of their inspiration. Some explicitly declare that they had received a commission to write: such are Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Habakkuk and others. David declares: "And the man who was raised on high saith, the Anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet Psalmist of Israel: The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was upon my tongue."—II. Sam. XXIII. 1, 2.

But in other inspired books we find no evidence that the author was conscious that he wrote under divine inspiration. The writer of the Second Book of Maccabees declares thus of his work:

"And all such things as have been comprised in five books by Jason of Cyrene, we have attempted to abridge in one book.

"For considering the multitude of books, and the difficulty that they find that desire to undertake the narrations of histories, because of the multitude of the matter,

"We have taken care for those indeed that are willing to read, that it might be a pleasure of mind: and for the studious, that they may more easily commit to memory: and that all that read might receive profit.

"And as to ourselves indeed, in undertaking this work of abridging, we have taken in hand no easy task, yea rather a business full of watching and sweat.

"But as they that prepare a feast, and seek to satisfy the will of others: for the sake of many, we willingly undergo the labour.

"Leaving to the authors the exact handling of every particular, and as for ourselves, according to the plan proposed, studying to be brief.

"For as the master builder of a new house must have care of the whole building: but he that taketh care to paint it, must seek out fit things for the adorning of it: so must it be judged for us.

"For to collect all that is to be known, to put the discourse in order, and curiously to discuss every particular point, is the duty of the author of a history:

"But to pursue brevity of speech, and to avoid nice declarations of things, is to be granted to him that maketh an abridgement." (II. Maccab. II. 24-32.)

The same writer draws his work to a conclusion in the following words:

"So these things being done with relation to Nicanor, and from that time the city being possessed by the Hebrews, I also will here make an end of my narration.

"Which if I have done well, and as it becometh the history, it is what I desired: but if not so perfectly, it must be pardoned me."—Chap. 15, Ver. 39.

There is strong evidence here that the writer was unconscious of his inspiration.

In the preamble of St. Luke's Gospel we find certain indications that he was not conscious of being an inspired writer. In such books as these therefore there is no intrinsic note to compel us to accept them as divine. It is a generally accepted truth by Catholic theologians that the author's consciousness of his inspiration enters not into the essential constituents of inspiration; but is of the nature of an accessory. Card. Franzelin declares: "As in the prophetic impulse to speak which St. Thomas, 2. 2. 173. a. 4, and other theologians distinguish from complete prophecy, (Cfr. Aug. Genes. ad litt. Lib. III. n. 37.), thus also in the inspiration to write it seems not essential that a man be conscious of his inspiration; nevertheless it should not be readily admitted that *de facto* any of our inspired writers was ignorant of his inspiration" (De Div. Trad. et Script. p. 358.) In a note in the same place he declares that it is not proven that any of our inspired writers was ignorant of his inspiration. Crets (De Div. Bib. Insp. Lovanii, 1886) and Pesch (De Insp. Script., 1906) are of the same opinion.

It seems far more probable to us to hold that some were not conscious of their inspiration. The case of the writer of the Second Book of Maccabees is perhaps the clearest instance. Since all admit that this consciousness in no way pertains to the essence of inspiration it seems that it should not be asserted of a book unless there be some evidences of its existence. No such evidences are found there. But

waiving this question of fact, our main position is established that divine revelation has not in itself the power of making itself authentically known to man. Even if the inspired agent were conscious of his inspiration, an examination of the issue will convince us that the testimony of the inspired agent, unsupported by the corroborative attestation of God, is not sufficient. In the first place, this means would be subject to hallucination, error, and fraud. Long would be the list of those who, from one or other of these motives, claimed inspiration from God. It would suffice to mention Muhammad and the founder of Mormonism, to specify the weakness of this criterion. But granted that the inspired agent did, in any case, so testify as to merit credence, the faith that these motives of credibility would produce would not be *divine faith*, which has for its formal motive the *authority of God*; but, at most, it would be only *human faith*; for the effect cannot be greater than the cause; and, as the cause of this credibility was not divine but human, the faith, its effect, would be no more than human faith. Now it is exacted that we believe in the Scriptures with a divine faith. Hence, granted that the testimony of the inspired writer might be trustworthy of itself, it could never produce more than human credibility, which is not sufficient to form a basis for *absolute and divine faith*. No creature can be trusted infinitely, but, when we are dealing with "God's epistle to his creature," absolute trust and certainty are required. It was fitting that an all-provident God should provide man with this means of certitude, and we believe that he has done so, and these considerations are leading us to investigate and establish it. The Prophets and Apostles merited divine faith for what they taught, because they, by miracles, established their divine commission to teach. In such case, this faith was rendered divine by the corroborative attestation of God through these miracles. But how shall man always and in every case be able to discriminate between the divine writings and books of purely human origin? The Prophets are gone, the Apostles are gone; their writings have undergone great vicissitudes. "We live amid the dust of systems and of creeds." In this remote age, is there any

adequate criterion, in virtue of which man can say, This book is of God, and this other is not? Were there not, God would not have sufficiently provided for man; he would no longer be the Heavenly Father.

Men, who still believe in a personal God, and a definite form of religion, generally admit that some such criterion must exist, but differ widely in defining it.

We do not deny that internal evidences are a partial criterion; but it is not a universal criterion for all the books. For instance there are many places in the New Testament where the books of the Old Testament are cited as Holy Scripture. These explicit quotations are in number about three hundred, and there are many more allusions of less proving force. The citation of a book of the Old Testament by Christ or any inspired writer of the New Testament as Holy Scripture is a subsidiary criterion of inspiration; but it is not an adequate and sufficient criterion, since it does not establish a complete list of the books. Not to mention the deuterocanonical books, there is no mention in the New Testament of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, the Canticle of Canticles, Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah, and Ecclesiastes: Ezekiel is only faintly alluded to. Therefore the testimony of the New Testament is neither complete nor exclusive; but only a positive proof of some books.

A text often used to prove the internal evidences of inspiration in the Scriptures themselves is taken from Second Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy III. 16. The passage, according to the Greek is as follows: "*Πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἔλεγχον, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν, πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.*"

The Vulgate renders the passage: "Omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata utilis est ad docendum, ad arguendum, ad corripiendum, ad erudiendum in justitia." The Roman Catholic version is in accord with the Vulgate: "All Scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice." It is evident from a scrutiny of the Greek text that the Vulgate does not adequately reproduce it. No account is taken in such version of the *καί*, which however appears in all the best codices. The Vulgate

expunging *καί*, would virtually insert the elliptical *ἔστι*, after *ὠφέλιμος*, thus making *θεόπνευστος* a qualifying characteristic, warranting the predication of *ὠφέλιμος*, of *πᾶσα γραφή*. By the expunging of the important particle *καί*, such sense can be gleaned from this passage; but, retaining such conjunction, whose presence rests upon the best data, I am at a loss to understand how they gather the meaning. Moreover, the context and parallel passages demand the sense which results from the retaining of the particle.

Of all the versions, the Ethiopic comes closest to the original. According to the Latin translation of the Ethiopic text by Walton, it is as follows: "Et tota scriptura per Spiritum Dei est, et prodest in omni doctrina et eruditione ad corrigendum et instruendum in veritate." Although this ancient and valued text departs somewhat from the verbally literal translation, it reproduces the full sense. We could perhaps literally translate the Greek: "All Scripture is divinely inspired *and* useful to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in righteousness." Thus it is in conformity with the Greek reading, with the Ethiopic, with the context, with other parallel passages, and with some of the best of the Fathers. We may instance one parallel passage: II. Pet. I. 20—21.

We think then that this sense is sufficiently evidenced so as to become practically certain. The passage thus becomes a direct testimony for the influence of God on Holy Scripture. Indeed, Paul's motive is to induce Timothy to entertain a divine regard for the Holy Writ; and for this reason he brings forward as a proof the divine element in all Scripture. It is not then a discriminative, conditional proposition, but a plain assertion of the authorship of God in the Holy Scripture. But this clear text may not be adduced with any profit as a criterion; because, first of all, it is, as Perrone says, begging the question to prove the divinity of the Holy Books from their own testimony. It is the *circulus vitiosus*. Again, even to those who grant the divine authority of the Epistle to Timothy, it only avails to prove the impress of the hand of God on Holy Scripture *in a general way*, but does not distinguish book from book, or form any

judgment concerning an official catalogue. We grant then that the text, as well as others of a similar nature, operates to prove the divine impulse of the Holy Ghost on Scripture in general, provided we once have received as granted that these books are of God; but we deny to all such texts any value to discern canonical from uncanonical books.

It is not conformable to the scope of this book to follow the progress of protestantism through all its changes and vagaries. We see in it a constant tendency to limit the divine element in the Holy Scriptures. All the protestant sects began with an exaggerated notion of the nature of the Scriptures. In the beginning Luther seems not to have formulated any theory of inspiration. He accepted the general principles then held by the Church from which he seceded, that God is the author of Holy Scripture, that the inspired writers are God's instruments, that the inspired writers had received an impulse from the Holy Ghost to write the words and the truths, and that the Holy Scriptures are the infallible word of God, not only in matters of faith and morals, but also in other things, and are free from error, etc. But having once thrown off subjection to authority, with his characteristic genius of audacity, he formulated new theories to meet every emergency in his inconsistent heresy. Luther's opinions present many contradictions, and his defenders are divided against themselves. Speaking of his audacious attitude toward Holy Scripture, Kier (*Bedarf es einer besondern Inspirationslehre?* 1891, 8) cites Luther as a proof that there is no need of any fixed theory of inspiration, and declares of him: "Of Luther the greatest scriptural theologian, well known is his remarkably free judgment, not alone concerning St. James, but also concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews, some of the Prophets, and St. Paul. He read the Bible as a *free* blessed child of God." This *freedom* moved him to reject according to his caprice whatever did not please his humor. When the Holy Scriptures pleased him, he extolled them above all other things: "But I, against the sayings of the fathers, of men, of angels, of demons, set up not ancient usage, not a multitude of men, but the word of the one eternal Majesty, which they are forced to approve.

"This is the work of God, not of us. Here I stand; here I sit; here I remain; here I glory; here I triumph; here I insult *papists*, Thomists, Henricists, sophists, and all the gates of Hell, and also the sayings of men even though holy, and erring custom. God's word is above all; God's power so strengthens me that I should not care if a thousand Augustines, a thousand Cyprians, a thousand *Henrician* Churches were opposed to me." (*Contra Henricum regem*, Opera Lat. Ed. Franc. VI. 437.)

But when the *papists* urged against him the Scriptures, he repudiates the Scriptures: "Thou urgest forward the slave, that is the Scriptures, and not the entire Scriptures, nor their better part, but certain places concerning works. I leave this slave to you; I urge forward the Lord, who is the King of the Scriptures, who became to me my merit, and the price of my justification and salvation. Him I hold; to him I cleave, and leave to thee works, which however thou never hast done," (*Comment. in Galat. III. 10.*)

"I care nothing for these. Do thou ever urge on the slave; I am bold in the Lord, who is Lord and King over the Scriptures. I ask not concerning all the sayings of Scripture, even though thou bringest more against me, for I have on my side the Master and Lord of the Scriptures."

The arch deceiver sets at variance with the Lord the message of God himself, and with marvelous arrogance begs the question. To the candid student of history, Luther must ever appear as a clever sophist, who, having thrown off all real belief in religion, played upon the ignorance, superficiality and credulity of the people.

Against the Sacramentarians Luther declared that one tittle of the Scriptures was greater than the heavens and the earth; but in another mood he rejected Scriptures which pleased not his caprice: "Finally St. John's Gospel, and First Epistle, St. Paul's Epistles, especially the Romans, to the Galatians, and that to the Ephesians, and St. Peter's First Epistle are the books which present to thee Christ and all things which are necessary and saving, even though thou never see or hear another book or doctrine. Therefore James' Epistle compared to these is verily a letter of

straw, because it has not in itself the Gospel spirit." (Welches die rechten und edlisten Bücher des N. T. sind; LXIII. 115.)

Of the Apocalypse of St. John, Luther declared: "In this book I leave every one to his own opinion, and I ask no one to accept my opinion or judgment. I speak what I feel. Many things are wanting in this book, which move me to hold it as neither apostolic nor prophetic. My spirit is not drawn to the book, and a sufficient cause why I esteem the book no higher is that in it Christ is neither taught nor acknowledged, a thing which first of all an apostle should do." (Vorrede zur Offenbarung St. Johannis, LXIII. 169 et seqq.)

According to Luther, "Ecclesiastes should be more complete; much has been excised from it; it has neither boots nor spurs, but rides in socks, as I was wont to do when still in the cloister." (Tischreden 2261, 2262; Ed. Erlang. LXII. 127—131.)

The genius of Luther pervades all protestantism, a false freedom, a subjectivism, and illogical sentimentalism.

Well does Rabaud declare of Luther: "His principle of critique was purely subjective: from the intensity with which Christ is preached he determined the inspiration and canonicity of a book. Is not this to abolish the authority of the Bible, and to substitute in its stead the individual conscience? Who shall determine the degree of faithfulness of the inspired writer? Who shall judge the purity of his doctrine? Who shall say if Christ is preached as it behooveth? This principle, in appearance more practical, but in reality equally as subjective as the principles of the other leaders of the Reformation led to the same result, the authority of the individual conscience, a theology read out of the Bible. Luther furnished the first and most remarkable example. By his audacious critique and his independence in regard to the *exterior* Scriptures, he placed the germs of the subsequent objections which were to shatter and ruin the doctrine of inspiration, which in common with his contemporaries Luther held, but which he admitted only in the passages in harmony with his theology, or his religious

sense." (*Histoire de la doctrine de l'inspiration des S. Ecritures dans les pays de langue française*, Paris, 1883, 39.)

The seed of rationalism which Luther sowed has produced dreadful fruit. All protestantism has become rationalistic. In our own country no protestant theologian accepts the Bible as the infallible word of God. In the protestant church in America as soon as a man propounds some audacious heresy he is made a hero. Protestant Germany is thoroughly rationalistic. Cardinal Manning had to deplore the drift of non-Catholic thought in England:

"It is therefore, no new thing in the history of the Church, nor, indeed, in the history of England since the Reformation. From the Deistical writers down to Thomas Paine, there has never wanted a succession of critics and objectors who have assailed the extrinsic or intrinsic authority of Holy Scripture.

"So far it is no new thing. But in one aspect, indeed, it is altogether new. It is new to find this form of scepticism put forth by writers of eminence for dignity and personal excellence, and mental cultivation, in the Church of England; by men, too, who still profess not only a faith in Christianity, but fidelity to the Anglican Church. Hitherto these forms of sceptical unbelief have worked outside the Church of England, and in hostility against it. Now they are within, and professing to be of it, and to serve it. Unpalatable as the truth may be, it is certain that a Rationalistic school imported from Germany has established itself within the Church of England; that its writers are highly respectable and cultivated men, and that though they may be few, yet the influence of their opinions is already widely spread, and that a very general sympathy with them already extends itself among the laity of the Anglican Church. This is certainly a phenomenon altogether new.

"Before entering upon the subject of this chapter, it would seem, therefore, to be seasonable to examine briefly the present state of the subject of Inspiration in the Church of England, and contrast with it the teaching of the Catholic Church upon this point.

"And first, as to the doctrine of the Church of England on Inspiration, it is to be remembered that though the Canon of Scripture was altered by the Anglican Reformation, the subject of inspiration was hardly discussed. The traditional teaching of the Catholic Theology, with its various opinions, were therefore passively retained. The earlier writers, such as Hooker, repeat the traditional formulas respecting the inspiration and veracity of Holy Scripture. Hooker's words are, 'He (that is, God) so employed them (the Prophets) in this heavenly work, that they neither spake nor wrote a word of their own, but uttered syllable by syllable as the Spirit put it into their mouths.'* Such was more or less the tone of the chief Anglican writers for a century after the Reformation.

"Perhaps the best example of the Anglican teaching on the subject will be found in Whitby's general Preface to his 'Paraphrase of the Gospels.' His opinion is as follows. He begins by adopting the distinction of the Jewish Church between the 'Prophets' and the 'Chetubin,' or holy writers, and therefore between the 'inspiration of suggestion' and the 'inspiration of direction.'

"He then lays down—

"1. First, that where there was no antecedent knowledge of the matter to be written, an inspiration of suggestion was vouchsafed to the Apostles; but that where such knowledge did antecedently exist, there was only an inspiration exciting them to write such matters, and directing them in the writing so as to preclude all error.

"2. Secondly, that in writing those things which were not antecedently known to them, either by natural reason including education, or previous revelation—*e.g.* the Incarnation, the vocation of the Gentiles, the apostasy of the latter times, the prophecies of the Apocalypse—they had an immediate suggestion of the Holy Spirit.

"3. Thirdly, that in all other matters they were directed so as to preclude error, and to confirm the truth whether by illumination in the meaning of the previous revelation, or by reasoning.

* *Works*, Vol. III. p. 62. Ed. Keble.

"4. Fourthly, that in the historical parts of the New Testament they were directed in all that is necessary to the truth of the facts related, but not as to the order or accessories of such events, unless these things affected the truth of the facts.

"5. Fifthly, that in relating the words or discourses of our Lord and of others, they were directed so as to preclude all error as to the substance, but not so as to reproduce the words.

"6. Lastly, that the inspiration or divine assistance of the sacred writers was such as 'will assure us of the truth of what they write, whether by inspiration of suggestion, or direction only, but not such as would imply that their very words were dictated, or their phrases suggested to them, by the Holy Ghost.*

"In Bishop Burnet may be seen a somewhat less explicit tone. He says, 'The laying down a scheme that asserts an immediate inspiration, which goes to the style, and to every tittle, and that denies any error to have crept *into any of the copies*, as it seems on the one hand to raise the honor of Scripture very highly, so it lies open on the other hand to great difficulties, which seem insuperable on that hypothesis.'†.

"Such was the current teaching of the most respectable class of Anglican divines, men of true learning and of sound judgment, in the best century of the Church of England. But I need quote no more. Let us now examine one or two of the modern opinions on the same subject.

"A member of the University of Oxford writes as follows:—'The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne. Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High.'‡ A member of Trinity College, Dublin, writes as follows:—'The

* Whitby's *Paraphrase*, Gen. Pref. p. 5-7. Ed. London, 1844.

† Burnet, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 117. Ed. Oxford.

‡ Burgon, *Inspiration and Interpretation of Holy Scripture*, p. 89, quoted by Dr. Colenso, Part I. p. 6.

opinion that the subject-matter alone of the Bible proceeded from the Holy Spirit, while its language was left to the unaided choice of the various writers, amounts to that fantastic notion which is the grand fallacy of many theories of Inspiration; namely, that two different spiritual agencies were in operation, one of which produced the phraseology in its outward form, while the other created within the soul the conceptions and thoughts of which such phraseology was the expression. The Holy Spirit, on the contrary, as the productive *principle*, embraces the entire activity of those whom He inspires, rendering their language the word of God. The entire substance and form of Scripture, whether resulting from revelation or natural knowledge, are thus blended together into one harmonious whole.* Once more. Dr. Arnold writes as follows: 'An inspired work is supposed to mean a work to which God has communicated His own perfections; so that the slightest error or defect of any kind in it is inconceivable, and that which is other than perfect in all points cannot be inspired. This is the unwarrantable interpretation of the word Inspiration. . . . Surely many of our words and many of our actions are spoken and done by the inspiration of God's Spirit. . . . Yet does the Holy Spirit so inspire us as to communicate to us His own perfections? Are our best works or words utterly free from error or from sin?† Mr. Jowett, in his well-known Essay on the 'Interpretation of Scripture,' after reciting the commonly-received theories of inspiration, proceeds as follows:—'Nor for any of the higher or supernatural views of Inspiration is there any foundation in the Gospels or Epistles. There is no appearance in their writings that the Evangelists or Apostles had any inward gift, or were subject to any power external to them different from that of preaching or teaching which they daily exercised; nor do they anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from error or infirmity. . . . The nature of Inspiration can only be known from

* Lee on the *Inspiration of the Holy Scripture*, pp. 32, 33.

† Arnold's *Sermons*, quoted by Stanley, *The Bible, its Form, and its Substance*, Preface, VII. VIII. IX.

the examination of Scripture. There is no other source to which we can turn for information; and we have no right to assume some imaginary doctrine of Inspiration like the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church. To the question, What is Inspiration? the first answer therefore is, That idea of Scripture which we gather from the knowledge of it.* Dr. Williams says, 'In the Bible, as an expression of devout reason, and therefore to be read with reason in freedom, he [Bunsen] finds a record of the spiritual giants whose experience generated the religious atmosphere we breathe.'

"I do not undertake to do more than recite these opinions of clergymen of the Church of England. It is not for us to say what is the authoritative doctrine of that body; but it has been recently declared by the highest Ecclesiastical tribunal, that the views of Inspiration last given are not inconsistent with the Anglican formularies. Dr. Lushington expressed himself as follows:—'As to the liberty of the Anglican clergy to examine and determine the text of Scripture, I exceedingly . . . doubt if this liberty can be extended beyond the limits I have mentioned, namely, certain verses or parts of Scripture. I think it could not be permitted to a clergyman to reject the whole of one of the books of Scripture.'†

"It is evident from the above quotations that the theory of Inspiration among many prominent men in the Anglican Church has been moving in the direction of the German Neology:" (Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost pp. 138—145.)

The tendency deplored by Manning has continued until now in protestant thought the Bible is a very secondary thing.

"Dr. Driver, canon of Christchurch, Oxford, in his work on the 'Literature of the Old Testament,' quotes with approval the following words of Professor Sanday, in regard to inspiration:

* *Essays and Reviews*, pp. 345, 347.

† Judgment—Bishop of Salisbury *versus* Williams, p. 16.

“ ‘In all that relates to the revelation of God and of His Will, the writers of the Bible assert for themselves a definite inspiration; they claim to speak with an authority higher than their own. But with regard to the narration of events, and to processes of literary composition, there is nothing so exceptional about them as to exempt them from the conditions to which other works would be exposed at the same time and place.’ ” Dub. Review, 1893, p. 533.

Driver himself declares that, “applied to the Bible, as a whole, the expression ‘Word of God’ seems to savour of the old theory of inspiration, which *no one now cares to maintain*.” (Driver’s Sermons on the Old Test. p. 158.)

“But it may be said: ‘These are the opinions of individual Anglicans; men of influence and learning no doubt, but still only individuals; they do not necessarily represent the formal teaching of the Church. What is the attitude of the bishops on this important question? What is the view of the *ecclesia docens* on inspiration?’

“One thing may safely be said: a remarkable harmony pervades their lordships’ words on the subject. Whether their teaching is likely to throw much light on the matter, we leave our readers to decide from the few specimens we adduce. ‘We heartily concur with the majority of our opponents,’ says the Bishop of Gloucester, in ‘Aids to Faith,’ p. 404, ‘in rejecting all theories of inspiration.’ ‘Our Church,’ says Bishop Thirlwall, charge for 1863, ‘has never attempted to determine the nature of the inspiration of sacred Scriptures.’ ‘If you ask me,’ writes Dr. Cotton, Bishop of Calcutta, ‘for a precise theory of Inspiration, I confess I can only urge you to repudiate all theories; to apply to theology the maxim which guided Newton in philosophy, *hypotheses non fingo*.’ Finally, to take one more instance, the Bishop of Winchester writes: ‘It seems pretty generally agreed, that definite theories of inspiration are doubtful and dangerous.’ (Manning, op. cit.)

When Dr. Frederick Temple was appointed Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury many took the appointment as a total surrender by the Anglican Church to the spirit of rationalism.

Mr. Jesse Locke thus speaks of Mr. Temple's theology:

"What sort of theology has been enthroned at Canterbury? What idea of religion does he hold and teach who now occupies what Anglicans like to call 'the chair of St. Augustine'? Fortunately for our inquiry Dr Temple's views on religion are easily accessible. He was the first essayist in a volume published in 1861, and entitled 'Essays and Reviews.' This book was the signal for a blaze of controversy. Its authors were clergymen of the Church of England, and its teaching was the frankest, boldest rationalism, which emasculated religion of the supernatural, and reduced it to a purely humanitarian basis. Orthodox, evangelical protestants—pious but illogical—were deeply shocked. A few quotations will give an idea of what the essayist taught on some important subjects.

"Dr. Temple, in his opening essay, 'The Education of the World,' plants himself squarely on that fundamental protestant principle of which rationalism is the necessary and legitimate fruit. The ultimate basis for religion, he claims, is to be found only in that 'inner voice' which should guide every man. There is nothing external which can be an authority; neither is the church. 'The Bible,' he says, 'in fact is hindered by its form from exercising a despotism over the human spirit. . . . The inner voice by the principle of private judgment puts conscience between us and the Bible, making conscience the supreme interpreter, whom it may be a duty to enlighten, but whom it can never be a duty to disobey ('Essays and Reviews,' p. 53). Again: 'When conscience and the Bible appear to differ, the pious Christian immediately concludes that he has not really understood the Bible.' That is, his private judgment is certainly right, and the Bible must be made to conform to it! This reduces religion to the purest individualism; makes as many different religions as there are individuals to hold them. And all are equally right! Suppose this principle applied to the law of the land, each man assuming that the law had no other interpreter than his own 'inner voice'!"

Mr. Locke then gives us a number of quotations from the essays of other writers in the same volume of "Essays

and Reviews," and though the "usual statement" was found in the preface, to the effect that each essayist was responsible for his own essay alone, Dr. Temple has, in the writer's judgment, made himself responsible for the views of these other writers by his failure to repudiate them. Some of these other essayists spoke of the doctrine of inspiration as "absurd," explained away the Messianic prophecies, characterizing as "distortion" the application of Isaiah's prophecies to the Messiah, and upheld the idea of a true national church as one that should include all the people of the nation, who should be born into membership in the church as they are born into civil rights. Referring to Mr. Temple's Bampton lectures, 1884, Mr. Locke writes:

"As to miracles, those of the Old Testament, he tells us, could never be proved. 'The times are remote; the date and authorship of the books are not established with certainty; the mixture of poetry with history is no longer capable of any sure separation into its parts' (p. 206). In the New Testament, he adds, we must admit that some unusual occurrences took place which struck the disciples and other observers as miracles, though they need not necessarily have been miracles 'in the scientific sense.' 'For instance, the miraculous healing of the sick may be no miracle in the strictest sense at all. It may be but an instance of the power of mind over body, a power which is undeniably not yet brought within the range of science, and which nevertheless may be really within its domain' (p. 195). Our Lord's miracles of healing may have been simply the result of this power and 'due to a superiority of this mental power to the similar power possessed by other men. Men seem to possess this power over their own bodies and over the bodies of others in different degrees' (p. 201). Even our Lord's resurrection from the dead is reached by this destructive criticism. 'Thus, for instance, it is quite possible that our Lord's resurrection may be found hereafter to be no miracle at all in the scientific sense. It foreshadows and begins the general resurrection; when that general resurrection comes we may find that it is, after all, the natural issue of physical laws always at work' (p. 196).

"If we ask, What, then, can be the object of miracles? Dr. Temple has his answer ready. If these events, though not really miraculous, have 'served their purpose, if they have arrested attention which would not otherwise have been arrested, if they have compelled belief,' then they have accomplished their true end. In other words, they were 'pious frauds' impressing a people naturally credulous and easily deceived, as the best way of conveying ethical truth to them. The protestant tradition persists in giving to the Society of Jesus the possession of 'The end justifies the means' as a principle of conduct; but Dr. Temple goes farther still, and carries the charge back from His faithful servants to the great Master Himself!"

For these views of the new archbishop, says Mr. Locke, the Anglican Church must be held responsible, since it has twice passed in review of them and refused to condemn either him or them, and has now received him as its head.

In May, 1904, Professor Marcus Dods of New College, Edinburgh, delivered a course of lectures before Lake Forest College, Ill. on "The Bible: Its Origin and Nature."

In his lecture on the Canon of Scripture he candidly declares:

"If you ask a Romanist why he accepts certain books as canonical, he has a perfectly intelligible answer ready. He accepts these books because the Church bids him do so. The Church has determined what books are canonical, and he accepts the decision of the Church. If you ask a protestant why he believes that just these books bound up together in his Bible are canonical, and neither more nor fewer, I fear that ninety-nine protestants out of a hundred could give you no answer that would satisfy a reasonable man. The protestant scorns the Romanist because he relies on the authority of the Church, but he cannot tell you on what authority he himself relies. The protestant watchword is, 'The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible,' but how many protestants are there who could make it quite clear that within the boards of their Bible they have the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible? If you asked them to show you that no canonical writing has been omitted

and that no uncanonical writing has been received, how will they proceed to do so? If you ask the average protestant to say why he receives the second Epistle of Peter, which a large part of the early Church declined to receive, or why he accepts the Epistle of James, regarding which Luther himself was more than doubtful,—what can he say but that the Church to which he belongs receives them? In other words, what is the difference between the protestant and the Romanist on this cardinal point of canonicity? Do not protestants and Romanists alike accept their canonical books at the hands of the Church?"

After reviewing the Catholic position superficially he endeavors to establish a protestant criterion by appealing to the direct influence of God upon the individual. Luther is his hero:

"There were two questions which Luther found himself driven to answer: What assures me that Scripture is the Word of God, and therefore authoritative? and, What books are Scripture? Prior to the question, What is the Canon of inspired Scripture? comes the question, Is there an inspired Scripture? Prior to the question, What writings contain the Word of God? comes the question, Is there a Word of God? We cannot understand Luther's answer to the one question unless we recognize his attitude toward the other.

"Now, according to Luther, the prior question, Is there a Word of God? or, Has God spoken? is answered in the affirmative, and with certainty, by every man in whom the Word of God attests its own Divine origin and authority, and it can be answered with an assured affirmative by none beside. Luther's explicit and constant teaching is that this word is self-evidencing, and needs no authority at its back, but carries in it its own authentication. Let us hear some of his strong statements to this effect. Showing that the question between himself and Rome was not whether God was to be obeyed when he spoke,—for they were agreed as to that,—he goes on: 'The Romanists say, Yes, but how can we know what is God's word, and what is true or false? We must learn it from the Pope and the Councils. Very well, let them decree and say what they will, still say I, Thou

can'st not rest thy confidence thereon, nor satisfy thy conscience: thou must thyself decide, thy neck is at stake, thy life is at stake. Therefore must God say to thee in thine heart, This is God's Word, else it is still undecided.' Again: 'Thou must be as certain that it is the Word of God as thou art certain that thou livest, and even more certain, for on this alone must thy conscience rest. And even if all men came, even the angels and all the world, and determined something, if thou can'st not form nor conclude the decision, thou art lost. For thou must not place thy decision on the Pope or any other, thou must thyself be so skilful that thou can'st say, God says this, not that; this is right, that is wrong; else it is not possible to endure. Dost thou stand upon Pope or Concilia? Then the Devil may at once knock a hole in thee and insinuate, 'How if it were false? how if they have erred?' Then thou art laid low at once. Therefore thou must bring *conscience* into play, that thou may'st boldly and defiantly say, That is God's word; on that will I risk body and life, and a hundred thousand necks if I had them. Therefore no one shall turn me from the word which God teaches me, and that must I know as certainly as that two and three make five, that an ell is longer than a half. That is certain, and though all the world speak to the contrary, still I know that it is not otherwise. Who decides me there? No man, but only the truth which is so perfectly certain that nobody can deny it.'

"Why is Luther so urgent on this point? He is urgent because he sees that the whole difference between himself and Rome hinges here. If he cannot make good this position, that the truth or the Word of God has power to verify itself as such to the conscience it awakens, he has no standing at all. The principle which made him a protestant, and which constitutes men protestants always, is simply this, that the soul needs not the intervention of any authority to bring it into contact with God and the truth, but that God and His truth have power to verify themselves to the individual. Luther did not accept the Gospel because it was written in a book he believed to be inspired, or canonical, or the word of God; but he accepted it because it brought new

life to his spirit and proved itself to be from God. He did not accept Christ because he had first of all accepted the Scriptures, but he accepted the Scriptures because they testified of a Christ he felt constrained to accept. In short, it is the truth which the Scriptures contain which certify him that they are the word of God; it is not his belief that they are the word of God which certifies him of the truth they contain. The proclamation of God's grace quickening a new life within him convinced him this proclamation was from God.

"The difference between the Romanist and the protestant is not what it is so often said to be, that the Romanist accepts the Church as his infallible authority, while the protestant accepts the Scriptures as his infallible authority. The Romanist equally with the protestant accepts the authority of Scripture. The difference lies deeper. The difference lies here: that the Romanist accepts Scripture as the word of God because the Church tells him so, the protestant accepts it as the word of God because God tells him so. The protestant believes it to be God's word because through it God has spoken to him in such sort as to convince him that it is God who here speaks. This is the one sure foundation-stone of protestantism,—the response of the individual conscience to the self-evidencing voice of God in Scripture. He does not need to go to the Church to ask if this be God's word; his conscience tells him it is. Deeper than that for a foundation of faith you cannot get, and any faith that is not so deeply founded is insecure—it may last, and it may bring a man to all needed benefit, but it is not reasonably defensible, and therefore it is liable to be upset.

"This, then, was Luther's first position regarding Scripture; this was the fundamental position on which protestantism is reared; viz. that through Scripture God Himself so speaks to the soul that the man is convinced without the intervention of any other proof or authority that this is the word of God. The individual does not need the Church to tell him that this is the word of God. God tells him so, and makes all other authority superfluous.

“But next comes the question, What writings contain this word? Are we to carry through this fundamental principle, and maintain that only such writings can be accounted Scripture as approve themselves to be God’s word by renewing or building up the fundamental faith in God which has already been quickened within us? This fundamental principle of protestantism—that God’s word is self-evidencing—can we carry it over to the subject of canonicity and make it the sole, absolute test of canonicity? Or can we at any rate say that whatever agrees with the word of God, which at first begot faith in us, and presents to us the same Gospel and the same Christ is canonical? This Luther does, subject to the limitation that it springs from the Apostolic Circle. Or can we only use this fundamental faith of our own as a negative test, rejecting whatever does *not harmonize* with that faith in Christ which has given us spiritual life, or at any rate whatever contradicts it? In other words, can I say that all those writings are canonical which awaken faith in me? or can I say that all those writings are canonical which present that same Christ, whose presentation at first awakened faith in me; or can I only say that those are certainly not canonical which do not harmonize with faith in Christ?

“Now we shall find Luther’s answer to these questions in the judgments he pronounced on the books actually forming our Canon. Taking up his translation of the New Testament, we find that the four writings—Hebrews, James, Jude, and Revelation—which he considered to be non-apostolic, are relegated to the end by themselves, and introduced with these significant words: ‘Up to this point we have been dealing with the quite certain (*rechten gewissen*) chief books (*Hauptbuecher*) of the New Testament. But these four following have in times past had a different position.’ He then goes on to prove briefly but convincingly that Hebrews is not by Paul nor by any Apostle, and after extolling its ability, and pointing out what he considered faulty, he remarks that ‘although the writer does not lay the *foundation* of faith, which is the apostolic function, he yet builds upon it gold, silver, precious stones, and if, in accordance with

Paul's words, he mingles some wood, hay, stubble, this is not to hinder us from accepting with all reverence his teaching—although it cannot in all respects be compared to the Apostolic Epistles.' His criticisms on the Apocalypse are also very outspoken: 'My spirit,' he says, 'can't accommodate itself to this book: *the reason being that I do not think Christ is taught therein.*'* His judgment of this book, however, underwent considerable modification; and although, in contradistinction to the body of modern critics, he seems never to have been convinced that it was written by the Apostle John, it is not probable that in his later years he would have spoken of it so slightly. But in his introductory remarks to the Epistle of James he shows more explicitly his criterion or test of canonicity. He refuses to admit this epistle among the *Hauptbuecher* of the New Testament, or to allow its apostolic authorship, and he defends his judgment in these words: 'Herein agree all the genuine (*rechtschaffene*) holy books, that they all preach and exhibit Christ. This, indeed, is the right touchstone (*der rechte Pruefstein*) to test all the books, —if one sees whether or not they present Christ, for all Scripture witnesses to Christ (Rom. iii. 21); and St. Paul will know nothing but Christ. That which does not teach Christ is not apostolic, though St. Peter or St. Paul teaches it. That which preaches Christ is apostolic, though Judas, Annas, Pilate, or Herod teaches it.'

"Luther's direct test of canonicity, then, is, Does the book in question occupy itself with Christ or does it not? So says Dorner:† 'The deciding principle as to whether a writing is to pass for canonical lies, in a dogmatic aspect, according to Luther, as well known, in this, whether it is occupied with Christ.' Luther, in short, recognizes that God has an end to secure in making a revelation, and this end is to bring clear before men His will for our salvation; or, in one word, Christ. The books that promote this end he accepts as canonical.

*Luther's "Prefaces" are to be found in old editions of his translations of the Bible. See also Reuss's "History of the Canon," p. 347.

†History of Protestant Theology, E. Tr. I., p. 252.

"But while this was Luther's final and determining test of canonicity, it is obvious that he at the same time employed some preliminary test. He applied his final test, not to all books he knew, but only to a number already selected and already passing for canonical. He never thought of carrying his principle through all literature and accepting as canonical every book that was occupied with Christ. He did not accept Augustine and Tauler as canonical, though to them he in great part owed his salvation, his peace, his light, his strength. And it may, on the other hand, be questioned whether, with all his boldness, he would have dared to reject any writing which was proved to be of apostolic authorship. In point of fact he does *not* reject any such writing. His test of canonicity is, in short, only a supplemental principle which can be applied only in a field already defined by the application of some other principle, or by some universal usage such as the Church-collection of Scriptures had sprung from. Luther's method is really this: he first accepts at the hand of Jerome certain candidates for admission into the Canon, and to these selected candidates he applies this test. He was aware that up to Jerome's time the Church had always been in doubt regarding certain of these writings, and to these he freely applies the testing question, Are they occupied with Christ?

"*Theoretically*, therefore, Reuss is right in saying that Luther did not look upon the Canon as a collection, more or less complete, of all the writings of a certain period or of a certain class of men, but as a body of writings destined by God *to teach a certain truth*; and accordingly the test of the individual writings must at bottom lie in the teaching itself.* But *practically* what Luther did was to apply this test only to writings which already had some claim to be considered apostolical. The course of his thought was briefly this: he arrived at faith in Christ before he reached any clear view of the inspiration or canonicity of certain writers; he reached faith in Christ apart from any doctrine regarding Scripture. But having believed in Christ, he found that certain men

*"History of Protestant Theology," E. Tr., I., page 344.

had been appointed by Christ to witness to the great facts of His life, death, resurrection, and gift of the Spirit. The same faith which accepts Christ as supreme, the same faith which produces self-verifying results in his soul compels him also to believe that the commission of Christ to His Apostles was actually effectual, and that they are the appointed, normative witnesses to Him and His salvation. The writings of these Apostles he accepts, though holding himself free to reject them if they contradict the fundamental faith in Christ which gave him his new life. The other books, whose authorship is doubtful, but which from the first have claimed admittance to the New Testament Canon, he judges purely on their merits, rejecting or admitting as he finds they do not or do fit into the apostolic teaching.

"This, it will be said, leaves a ragged edge on the Canon. It leaves much to be decided by the individual. A man may say to Luther, 'I do not find in the gospel of John agreement with the three synoptic gospels, and as you throw over James because he does not agree with Paul, so I throw over John because he does not agree with the synoptists.' And Luther could have made no satisfactory reply. Better, he would think, let a man accept Scripture from his own feeling of its truth than compel him to do so by some external compulsion. Indeed, his boldness in pronouncing his own opinion is quite equalled by his explicit and repeated allowance of liberty to every other man. Thus, though he himself did not accept the Apocalypse as the work of John, he hastens to add, 'No man ought to be hindered from holding it to be a work of St. John or otherwise as he will.' Similarly, after giving his opinion of the Epistle of James, he concludes, 'I cannot then place it among the chief books, but I will forbid no one to place and elevate it as he pleases.' So that if we find ourselves in disagreement with Luther regarding the judgments he pronounces on some of the books of Scripture, this is only what he himself anticipated. Neither does the fact that his principle can never be applied without such discordant results emerging, reflect any discredit on the principle itself. As Reuss says, 'To begin to speak to-day of the infatuation of Luther's method of procedure, because in the

details of its application one cannot always share in his opinion, this only proves that with the modern champions of a pretended, privileged orthodoxy, ignorance and fatuity go hand and hand in the van.'

"The same vagueness which marred the Lutheran doctrine of canonicity affected the Calvinistic position. The inward witness cannot reasonably be expected to be sufficient for the task of certifying every word that God has uttered to man. It cannot, in other words, be expected to form of itself a sufficient test of canonicity.

"The truth is there seems to have been some confusion of thought in Calvinistic writers, arising from the fact that in speaking of the *authority* of Scripture they viewed Scripture as a whole. Challenged by the Romanists to say how they knew the Bible to be from God, they said, We know it to be from God because God's Spirit within us recognizes it as His. But this inward witness could only become a test of canonicity if the Bible were an indissoluble whole, part hanging with part, so that each part stands or falls with every other part.

"If, in order to prove the canonicity of *all* the writings in the Bible, it were enough to say, the Spirit within me recognizes God's voice in the Bible as a whole, then this were a sufficient test. If, in order to prove the canonicity of the Epistle of James, it were enough to say, I recognize the voice of God in the Epistle of John, then the 'inward witness of the Spirit' would be a sufficient test. But the very thing we are seeking for is *that which brought the parts together*, the principle on which the Church proceeded when it took one writing here and another there and brought them into one whole. What is it which is characteristic of each part, so that even when the parts were lying separate, they could be and were recognized as properly belonging to the Canonical Scriptures? The question seeking solution is, why do we receive this or that book into the Canon? There is no question here as to whether we have a word of God, nor as to the *general* collection of writings in which we find that word; the question is, how do we know that the Epistle to the Hebrews or the Epistle of Jude, or any other individual writing, is the word of God?

“The Westminster Confession makes ‘inspiration’ the test of canonicity, although it does not in express terms say so. After naming the books of the Old and New Testament, it proceeds, ‘all which are given by inspiration of God;’ and then in section three it goes on, ‘The books commonly called Apocrypha, *not being of Divine inspiration*, are no part of the Canon of Scripture.’ That is to say, writings which are inspired are canonical, writings not inspired are not canonical. But how are we to discover what writings are inspired? The Confession, singularly enough, says nothing of prophetic and apostolic authorship, but refers us to the various marks of divinity in the writings themselves, and concludes in the well-known words, ‘Our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and Divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts.’

“There are two processes by which we can arrive at the conclusion that a writing is inspired. First, as in reading any book we form an opinion of it, and either pronounce it stupid or feel in it the touch of genius, so in reading the work of an inspired man we may arrive at the conclusion that it has been written with Divine aid. There may be that in it which makes us feel that we have to do with a Divine as well as a human author. Second, we may believe in the inspiration of a book, because we first of all believe in Christ, and find that He authorized certain persons to speak in His name and with His authority and spirit. When the well-authenticated writings of such persons come into our hands, we accept them, if we are already Christian.

“But there are books in the Bible whose inspiration cannot be ascertained by either of these methods. There are books of which we cannot say that they are written by prophet or apostle or otherwise commissioned person; Chronicles, Esther, Job, Ecclesiastes,—no one knows who wrote these books. One of the methods of ascertaining inspiration is therefore closed to us. And as to the other method, the inward witness, I am not persuaded that John Owen himself could have detected the book of Esther as an inspired book, had it been found lying outside the Canon. How, then,

can we justify the admission of such a book as Esther—a book of which the authorship is unknown, and to which the inward witness bears at the best a somewhat doubtful testimony so far as regards its inspiration?

“To say that we accept it because the Jews accepted it, is simply to fall back to the Romanist position and take our Canon at the hands and by the authority of the Church. To affirm that the men who settled the Canon were inspired, is to assume what cannot be proved, and even to affirm what we know to be false, because discussion was still going on among the Jews regarding their Canon as late as the year 96 A. D. We can only justify the admission of these books on some such general ground as that of Luther—their congruity to the main end of revelation. If by ‘canonical writings’ we mean the writings through which God conveys to us the knowledge of the revelation He has made, if this be the prominent idea, and if their being the rule of faith and life be an inference from this, then we get a broader basis for the Canon and can admit into it all writings which have a direct connection with God’s revelation of Himself in Christ. If the book in question gives us a link in the history of that revelation, or if it represents a stage of God’s dealings and of the growth His people had made under these dealings, and if it contains nothing which is quite inconsistent with the idea of its being inspired, then its claim to be admitted seems valid. Therefore I would be disposed to say that the two attributes which give canonicity are congruity with the main end of revelation and direct historical connection with the revelation of God in history.*

“It may indeed be said that if such a book as Esther were lost, nothing that is *essential* to the history would be lost, or that if several of the Psalms were lost nothing essential would be lost. But this is really to say no more than that a man who has lost a joint of a finger or a toe has lost nothing *essential*. No doubt he can live on and do his work, but he is not a complete man. And there are parts of the body of which it is very difficult to say why they are there, or why they are

*A similar, if not indetical, conclusion was reached by the late A. B. Bruce, but I have lost the reference.

of the particular form they are; but there they are, and the want of them would seem a deformity. So of the Bible, we may not be able to say of every part that it its exact relation to the whole; nor yet may we be able in honesty to say that we think anything essential would be lost were certain portions of Scripture to be removed; and yet he would be a rash man who would dare to aver that he could improve upon the Canon, or who should think it needful to excise from it such parts as to himself may seem unimportant.

“From all this, then, we must gather (1) that churches should be cautious in speaking of the Canon as an absolutely defined collection of writings, thoroughly and to a nicety ascertained, based on distinct principles and precisely separated at every point from all extracanonical literature. There is no reasonable doubt that the bulk of the books of the New Testament come to us so accredited that to reject them is equivalent to rejecting the authority of Christ; but a few are not so accredited, and it is a question whether our creeds ought not to reflect the fact that in the early Church some books were universally admitted into the Canon, while regarding seven of the books of our New Testament grave doubts were entertained. The position taken by one of the greatest champions of protestantism, Chillingworth, is one that commends itself: ‘I *may* believe even those questioned books to have been written by the Apostles and to be canonical; but I cannot in reason believe this of them so undoubtedly as of those books which were never questioned: at least I have no warrant to damn any man that shall doubt of them or deny them now, having the example of saints in heaven, either to justify or excuse such their doubting or denial.’ This was the position of Luther and of the Reformers generally, and for my part I think it a pity it was ever abandoned. It is not a calamity over which one need make great moan, but unquestionably the combining of less authenticated books with those that are thoroughly authenticated has rather tended to bring the latter class under suspicion with persons ignorant of their history.

“We also gather (2) what ought to be the attitude of the ordinary lay protestant toward this subject of the Canon.

Sometimes Romanists have taunted us with the absurdity of inviting each protestant, educated or uneducated, to settle the Canon for himself. The taunt is based on a misconception. It is the *right* of every protestant to inquire into the evidence on which certain books are received as canonical, and the more that right is exercised, the better. But even when the right is not used, it is not thereby resigned. Protestants receive the Canon as they receive historical facts, on the testimony of those who have pursued this line of inquiry. We may never have individually looked into the evidence for Alexander's invasion of India, but we take it on the word of those best informed regarding historical matters, reserving of course the right to examine it ourselves if need arises. So on this subject of the Canon, the lay protestant accepts the judgment of the Reformed Churches, feeling tolerably confident that after all the research and discussion which learned men have spent upon this subject, the result cannot be seriously misleading. But he of course reserves the right to inquire for himself if opportunity should arise, and does not dream that the decision of the Church binds him to accept certain books as Divine. The protestant accepts the decision of the Church precisely as he accepts the decision of engineers or medical men or experts of any kind in their respective departments—he accepts it as the result arrived at after deliberation by competent men. The Romanist accepts the decision of the Church as a decree of law issued because the Church wills it so, and not as the mere finding of learned men; and the Romanist has no right to revise the Church's decision. The Romanist holds that the Church has power to make books canonical; the protestant holds that irrespective of any ecclesiastical decision there is that in the books themselves which makes them canonical. To confound the two positions is ignorant or malicious.

“(3) Again, protestants are taunted with the diversity of opinion consequent on leaving such questions to individual research and private judgment. I reply that it is a vast advantage so to leave such questions, for it is to invite investigation, and to invite investigation is to secure that one day the truth will shine in the eye of the world. What

value attaches to the unanimity that is secured by closing every one's eyes, and shutting every one's mouth? That unanimity alone is valuable which the truth itself commands. And this unanimity can only be attained by diligent, reverent, truth-seeking investigation. For my part, I think Luther was right in holding that regarding some of the books there must be difference of opinion always; but of the great bulk of the New Testament,—the four Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles of Paul, the First of Peter, and the First of John,—as there was no difference of opinion in the early Church, so eventually there will be an entire agreement. Men do not differ regarding the authorship of 'Hamlet,' nor the esteem in which that writing should be held, neither will private judgment and liberty of criticism cause men to differ regarding the canonical books, but will rather bring them to the only agreement that is worth having.

"Lastly, let us remember that the true protestant order is, first, faith in Christ; second, faith in Scripture. Our faith in Christ does not hang upon our faith in Scripture, but our faith in Scripture hangs upon our faith in Christ. Our faith in Christ may depend on Scripture as a true history; but not as an inspired canonical book. It is Christ as presented in Scripture or by other means, by preaching as in the first age, and often now, that evokes faith. He and he only is the true protestant who knows that God has spoken to him in Christ, and who knows this irrespective of any infallible authority separable from Christ himself, whether that authority be the authority of the Church or the authority of Scripture. We must not shift the ultimate authority from Christ to Scripture."

We have presented this long quotation as it sums up the position of what might be considered the most conservative protestantism. The very principle on which protestantism was founded must lead to rationalism and it has led to it. Outside the Catholic Church dogma is decried as narrow and bigoted, and the Scriptures are only stray records of man's striving after God. According to them the Scriptures are the product of the thought of successive ages, and reflect the evolution of Man's conceptions of the Deity, and of his state

of culture. Much therefore in them is to be attributed to the erroneous ideas of that cruder age, and therefore now must be discarded, as not in harmony with our finer ideas. When Dods wrote his statement he had not read Tolstoi's criticism of Hamlet.

The force with which these liberal ideas are propounded and the popularity which they acquire have led astray some of the members of the Catholic Church. The progress of the movement evoked from the venerable Head of the Church a powerful denunciation in his address to the newly created cardinals on April 18, of the present year. We quote the following short passage:

"For these modern heretics, the Holy Scripture is not a sure source of all the truths concerning faith, but an ordinary book. For them inspiration reduces itself to dogmatic doctrines understood in their own fashion, and differs but little from the poetic inspiration of Æschylus and of Homer. According to them the legitimate interpreter of the Bible is the Church, but the Church subject to the rules of so called critical science which dominates and enslaves theology. As for tradition, everything is relative and subject to mutations, consequently the authority of the holy Fathers is reduced to a nullity. All these numerous errors are propagated by means of pamphlets, reviews, books on asceticism, and even novels. These errors are wrapt up in certain ambiguous terms and in vague forms in order that there may be always an opening for defense, so as not to incur a formal condemnation while at the same time the unwary may be taken in the toils."

The protestant subjectivism crude and indefinite in Luther, was more definitely formulated by Zwinglius, Calvin, and their followers. Thus Zwinglius declares: "I know that I am taught of God because I feel him. Let no one raise the objection: How knowest thou that thou art taught of God? When I was a youth I had not progressed more in human knowledge than my equals. But when seven or eight years ago I began to devote myself entirely to the Scriptures, the philosophy and theology of cavilers continually aimed at me objections. Wherefore relying on the Scriptures and the

word of God I came to this conclusion: Thou must leave all, and learn the pure teaching of God from his own plain word. Then I began to ask God for light, and the Scriptures, though I read only them, they began to be much clearer than if I read many commentaries and commentators." (Huldreich Zwinglis Werke, I. 79).

Relying on this same spirit Zwinglius declares of Luther: "Clearly and dispassionately I shall show that in the doctrine of this sacrament (the Eucharist) the almighty God has not revealed the secrets of his counsels to Martin Luther." (Ibid.)

For his criterion Calvin appeals to the secret testimony of the Spirit, *arcanum testimonium Spiritus*: "It remains therefore firmly established that the Scripture is *αὐτόπιστον*: neither is it right to subject the Scriptures to the logical demonstration; and the Spirit establishes a certitude by his testimony. . . . Illumined therefore by his power we conclude with certainty, no less than if we saw in them the divinity of God himself, that by the ministry of men they have come down to us from the mouth of God." (Instit. Christ. Rel. 6).

Calvin admitted as subsidiary helps the harmony, dignity, truth, simplicity, power, and sublimity of the Scriptures.

In the year 1675 Henry Heidegger drew up a Helvetican Formula in which this declaration occurs: "The Hebrew text of the Old Testament which we have received from the Jewish church, to which of old the oracles of God were committed, we receive and hold fast, both the consonants and the vowel points, or at least their value, and we hold both the truths and the words to be inspired." (Niemeyer Collect. Conf.)

This extreme formula was abrogated in 1725. All the Calvinist formulas, the Gallican, Scotch, Belgian, Anglican, and Bohemian, set up the testimony of the Spirit as the criterion of inspiration.

The Westminster Conf. I. 5 reads thus: "We may be moved and influenced by the testimony of the Church to a high and reverent esteem of the holy scripture, and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the

majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God; yet notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Ghost bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts."

We see a general tendency in protestantism to appeal to the tradition of the Jews as a criterion of the Old Testament. Thus John Gerhard (*De Locis Theol.*) declares: "That a book of the Old Testament should be canonical, it is necessary that it should be written in the prophetic, that is, the Hebrew tongue."

Hence those protestants who saw the futility of the subjective criterion were more anxious to find a criterion for the New Testament. John David Michælis of Göttingen († 1791) rejected all subjective criterions, and established for the New Testament one criterion, to wit, that a book of the New Testament is canonical if written by one who has received the Apostolic commission. He therefore rejected the Gospels of Mark and Luke and the Acts of the Apostles.

(*Einleitung in die Göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes.*)

Concerning the affirmative sense of this statement Catholic theologians differ. Perrone and Franzelin, and more recently Crets (*De Div. Insp.*) Schmid, Chauvin, Zanecchia, Scheeben, Heinrich, Hurter, and Pesch (*De Insp. Sac. Script. Friburgi* 1906) deny it; Ubaldi (*Introd. in S. Script.* 1878) and Schanz (*Apologie*) defend it. However it seems certain that if an apostle wrote as a teacher of the faithful, on a theme connected with religion, his writings *ipso facto* would be inspired. In other words whenever an apostle exercised his apostolic office of teaching he was inspired, whether he spoke or wrote.

But Michælis' criterion is inadequate, because the apostolic commission is not an exclusive condition of an inspired

writer. No one now would accept a criterion that excludes Mark, Luke and Acts. Again a criterion must tell me not only that, *if a book be written under certain conditions, it is inspired*, but it must tell me that certain definite books unconditionally are inspired. What avails it, if a man tell me that, if the Second Epistle of Peter be written by him, it is inspired? What I must know is that it is the word of God.

It is evident that the subsidiary criteria appealed to by Calvin are not sufficient to form a criterion. The Imitation of Christ, and certain sermons of the Fathers are more sublime than Chronicles and Ezra. The "inner voice" is repudiated by candid protestants.

John David Michaelis, the learned professor of Göttingen, speaks thus of this means: "This interior sensation of the effects of the Holy Ghost, and the conviction of the utility of these writings to better the heart and purify us are entirely *uncertain criterions*. As regards this interior sensation, I avow that I have never experienced it, and those who have felt it are not to be envied. It cannot evince the divine character of the book, since the Muhammadans feel it as well as Christians, and pious sentiments can be aroused by documents purely human, by the writings of philosophers, and even by doctrine founded in error." (*Einleitung in die Göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes.*) Burnett also, in his Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, speaks thus of this subjective criterion: "This is only an argument to him that feels it, if it is one at all; and, therefore, it proves nothing to another person." No *subjective criterion* could ever be apt for such use, since it would depend on the subjective dispositions of individuals, and one and the same individual would, at different times, be differently affected by the same book. Moreover, this pious movement can come from other than inspired books. A man will feel more religious emotion from the reading of the Imitation of Christ than from the Book of Judges. But experience itself disproves this system. Honest men attest that they do not feel this pious movement, and the opinion may now be said to be obsolete.

The Calvinists' particular inspiration of the Holy Ghost in the individual's soul is cognate to the Calvinistic theory of

the invisible church, and they both fall together. Once establish a visible authoritative Magisterium, and such means of interpreting Holy Scripture becomes incompatible with it. It is evident that such a system of private inspiration can never be proven. There never can be any available data to establish such secret action. It must ever remain a gratuitous, groundless assumption. It is exactly opposite to the economy of God. When He would teach the world, He did it by means of divinely commissioned men, directly establishing that such mode of teaching truth would last always. This were absurd, were the evangelization of mankind to be effected by the sole direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost in the heart. To be sure, no man can be brought to Christ without that working of the Holy Ghost in his heart. "*Nemo potest venire ad me, nisi Pater traxerit eum.*" But the error of protestants is to believe that this energy of the Spirit in man's soul excludes the external authoritative Magisterium. The power of the Spirit and the Magisterium are two causes co-operating to produce one effect. All the texts of Scripture alleged by the protestants, in support of this system, simply prove that the Holy Ghost moves man to Christian belief and to Christian action; and the same power energizing in the Church vitalizes it, and renders it capable of its great mission to teach all mankind. We will leave the prosecution of this train of argument to the tract *De Locis Theologicis*, and content ourselves here with a few *a posteriori* arguments. In the first place, did the Holy Ghost exert such action, he would, doubtless, move to a unanimity of faith; but the exact contrary is in fact verified. The sect of Presbyterians are split on some of the basic truths of Christianity. Can the Spirit of truth inspire them with doctrines directly opposed? The recent Briggs controversy has shown the lack of any religious harmony in the Presbyterian church.

I will here excerpt from Milner's *End of Controversy* a few examples of men who claimed this inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The instances are based upon incontrovertible historical data. Montanus and his sect first claimed this private inspiration; we may see what spirit led him on, since

he and others of his sect hanged themselves. After the great Apostasy, commonly called the Reformation, had been inaugurated by Luther, there arose the sect of the Anabaptists, who professed that it had been commanded them by direct communication from God to kill all the wicked ones, and establish a kingdom of the just.* Bockhold, a tailor of Leyden, was moved by the *private inspiration* of the Spirit to proclaim himself King of Sion. He married by the same impulse eleven wives, all of whom he put to death. He declared that God had given him Amsterdam, through whose streets his followers ran naked crying out; "Woe to Babylon! Woe to the wicked!" Hermann, the Anabaptist, was moved to proclaim himself the Messiah, and to order: "Kill the priests; kill all the magistrates in the world! Repent; your redemption is at hand." †

All these excesses were done upon the principle and under a full conviction of an individual inspiration. In England, Venner was *inspired* to rush from the meeting-house in Coleman St., proclaiming "that he would acknowledge no sovereign but King Jesus, and that he would not sheathe his sword, till he had made Babylon [which emblemized monarchy] a hissing and a curse, not only in England, but also in foreign countries; having assurance that one of them would put to flight a thousand, and two of them, ten thousand." On the scaffold, he protested that he was led by Jesus. The records of George Fox, the founder of Quakerism, furnish abundant evidence of the abominable absurdities into which this supposed inspiration led the Friends. One woman rushed naked into Whitehall Chapel, when Cromwell was there. Another came into the parliament house with a trencher, which she there broke in pieces, saying: "Thus shall he be broken in pieces." Swedenborg declared that he had received, at an eating house in London, the commission from Christ: "I am the Lord Jesus Christ, your Creator and Redeemer. I have chosen you to explain to men the interior and spiritual sense of the Scriptures. I

* Sleidan De Stat. et Reip.

† Hist. Abrégé, de la Réforme par Brandt.

will dictate to you what you are to write." Here, in the very position of the system, he contradicts himself; for, if Christ gave him a command to teach men, they must needs pay heed to him. Muhammad, and the founder of the foul sect of Mormons, claimed private inspiration. Guiteau claimed the moving of the Spirit in the slaying of President Garfield. Wherefore, we maintain that the system of private inspiration, which logically leads to such absurdities, is in itself absurd and untenable.

No man makes a better argument against the insufficiency of protestant criteria than Marcus Dods in his article which we have quoted. If any man will weigh this able presentation of the necessity which confronts a protestant with the vague answer which Dods renders he must be convinced that protestants are at sea without compass or star.

We have in series weighed these several criterions and found them wanting, we now turn to the CATHOLIC CRITERION.

This criterion is no other than the Catholic Church, into whose custody the Holy Writings have been given. The Church as an organized body has various elements and agencies, which functionate to teach man that truth which the Redeemer promised should be taught by her to the end of time. One of these agencies is tradition, which is simply the solemn witness and testimony of what the Church taught and believed from her inception. We can see at a glance that the fountain source of our criterion is God himself, who, as the First Cause, wrought this effect in the mind of the writer. God through his living Magisterium of truth tells us what is Holy Scripture, and what is not, and those who refuse to hear that authoritative voice have come to reject even the Scriptures themselves. Such rejection must logically follow from disbelief in the Church. Augustine was never truer than when he said: "Were it not that the Authority of the Church moves me, I would not believe the Gospels." Rejecting the authority of the Church, the protestants have passed through a wondrous transition. Beginning by ador-

ing even the Masoretic points, they have gradually lapsed to such a point where those who believe in the Bible as the infallible Word of God are the exceptions.

There remains then one means, and one means only, to teach man not only the *truths of Scripture*, but also the *Scripture of truths*. This means is the voice of God through the Church.

The mighty mind of St. Augustine clearly saw and proclaimed the necessity of the Church as the criterion of Scripture. Arguing with a Manichæan he declares: "I ask: Who is this Manichæus? Ye will answer: The Apostle of Jesus Christ; I believe it not; and now thou art not able to do or say anything. Thou didst promise me a knowledge of truth, and now thou obligest me to believe what I know not. Perhaps thou wilt read me the Gospel, and thence endeavor to establish the existence of Manichæus. But if thou findest one who not yet believes the Gospel what wilt thou say to one who declares to thee: I do not believe? And I would not believe the Gospel were it not that the authority of the Catholic Church moved me."

In placing the Church as the supreme judge of the Canon we do not assert that the Church has power to make an inspired book. In the words of Melchior Canus: "This is to be demonstrated that the Church of the faithful still on earth can not write a canonical book; but that it can define whether or not a disputed book be canonical, because the solution of doubts regarding matters of faith belongs to the present Church. For it is necessary that there should be a visible judge in the Church to decide controversies, for the reason that God fails not the Church in necessary things. And whether or not a book be canonical vitally concerns faith. Therefore to the Church on earth pertains this judgment. . . . I firmly believe therefore that the Church is inspired not to give truth and authority to the canonical books, but to teach that these and not others are canonical" (De Locis Theol. 7,8).

The Church must teach us two things; what books are of God; and what influence God had in such books. We shall treat first of God's influence upon the Holy Books; and,

secondly, of the official list of those books. As it is well to know the nature of the thing sought, before going in quest of it, so we believe that we shall be aided in constructing the list of books of Holy Scripture by a knowledge of the distinguishing element required in them, before admitting them to such list. Our treatise will deal first, therefore, with the NATURE AND EXTENT OF INSPIRATION, and secondly with THE CANON.

At this point we shall submit a document which, though not a dogmatic pronouncement, is still an authoritative directing voice from the Head of the Church. This document is the encyclical letter "Providentissimus Deus" of Pope Leo XIII. on the study of Holy Scriptures, which appeared on Nov. 18, 1893. The immediate occasion of the encyclical letter was a defense of Lenormant by d'Hulst entitled "La Question Biblique" which was published at Paris in 1893. We give the following translation of the papal document "Providentissimus Deus:"—"The God of all Providence, Who in the adorable designs of His love at first elevated the human race to the participation of the Divine nature, and afterwards delivered it from universal guilt and ruin, restoring it to its primitive dignity, has, in consequence, bestowed upon man a splendid gift and safeguard—making known to him, by supernatural means, the hidden mysteries of His Divinity, His wisdom and His mercy. For although in Divine revelation there are contained some things which are not beyond the reach of unassisted reason, and which are made the objects of such revelation in order 'that all may come to know them with *facility, certainty, and safety from error*, yet not on this account can supernatural Revelation be said to be absolutely necessary; it is only necessary because God has ordained man to a supernatural end.' [Conc. Vat. Sess. III. *cap. ii. de revel.*] This supernatural revelation, according to the belief of the universal Church is contained *both in unwritten Tradition, and in written books*, which are therefore, called sacred and canonical because, 'being written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, *they have God for their author*, and as such have been delivered to the Church.' [*Ibid.*] This belief has been perpetually held and professed by the

Church in regard to the Books of both Testaments; and there are well-known documents of the gravest kind, coming down to us from the earliest times, which proclaim that God, Who spoke first by the Prophets, then by His own mouth, and lastly by the Apostles, composed also the Canonical Scriptures, [S. Aug. *de civ. Dei*. XI., 3.] and that these are His own oracles and words—[S. Clem. Rom. 1 ad. Cor. 45; S. Polycarp. ad Phil. 7; S. Iren. *c. haer.* II., 28, 2]—a Letter written by our Heavenly Father and transmitted by the sacred writers to the human race in its pilgrimage so far from its heavenly country. [S. Chrys. in *Gen. hom.* 2, 2; S. Aug. in *Ps. XXX.*, *serm.*, 2, 1; S. Greg. M. ad Theo. *ep.* IV., 31.] If, then, such and so great is the excellence and dignity of the Scriptures, that God Himself has composed them, and that they treat of God's marvellous mysteries, counsels, and works, it follows that the branch of sacred Theology, which is concerned with the defence and elucidation of these Divine Books, must be excellent and useful in the highest degree.

“Now We, who by the help of God, and not without fruit, have by frequent Letters and exhortation endeavored to promote other branches of study which seem capable of advancing the glory of God, and contributing to the salvation of souls, have for a long time cherished the desire to give an impulse to the noble science of Holy Scripture, and to impart to Scripture study a direction suitable to the needs of the present day. The solicitude of the Apostolic office naturally urges, and even compels us, not only to desire that this grand source of Catholic revelation should be made safely and abundantly accessible to the flock of Jesus Christ, but also not to suffer any attempt to defile or corrupt it, either on the part of those who impiously or openly assail the Scriptures, or of those who are led astray into fallacious and imprudent novelties. We are not ignorant, indeed, Venerable Brethren, that there are not a few Catholics, men of talent and learning, who do devote themselves with ardor to the defence of the Sacred Writings and to making them known and better understood. But whilst giving to these the commendation they deserve, We cannot but earnestly exhort others also, from whose skill and piety

and learning we have a right to expect good results, to give themselves to the same most praiseworthy work. It is Our wish and fervent desire to see an increase in the number of the approved and persevering laborers in the cause of Holy Scripture; and more especially that those whom Divine Grace has called to Holy Orders, should, day by day, as their state demands, display greater diligence and industry in reading, meditating and explaining it.

HOLY SCRIPTURE MOST PROFITABLE TO DOCTRINE
AND MORALITY.

“Among the reasons for which the Holy Scripture is so worthy of commendation—in addition to its own excellence and to the homage which we owe to God’s Word—the chief of all is, the innumerable benefits of which it is the source; according to the infallible testimony of the Holy Ghost Himself, who says: ‘All Scripture, inspired by God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work.’ [Tim. III., 16—17.] That such was the purpose of God in giving the Scripture to men is shown by the example of Christ our Lord and of His Apostles. For He Himself who ‘obtained authority by miracles, merited belief by authority, and by belief drew to himself the multitude’ [S. Aug. *de util. cred.* XIV. 32.] was accustomed in the exercise of His Divine Mission, to appeal to the Scriptures. He uses them at times to prove that He is sent by God, and is God Himself. From them He cites instructions for His disciples and confirmation of His doctrine. He vindicates them from the calumnies of objectors; He quotes them against Sadducees and Pharisees, and retorts from them upon Satan himself when he dares to tempt Him. At the close of His life His utterances are from the Holy Scripture, and it is the Scripture that He expounds to His disciples after His resurrection, until He ascends to the glory of His Father. Faithful to His precepts, the Apostles, although He Himself granted ‘signs and wonders to be done by their hands,’ [Act. XIV., 3.] nevertheless used with the greatest effect the Sacred Writings, in order to persuade the nations every-

where of the wisdom of Christianity, to conquer the obstinacy of the Jews, and to suppress the outbreak of heresy. This is plainly seen in their discourses, especially in those of St. Peter; these were often a little less than a series of citations from the Old Testament making in the strongest manner for the new dispensation. We find the same thing in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John and in the Catholic Epistles; and most remarkably of all in the words of him, who 'boasts that he learned the law at the feet of Gamaliel, in order that, being armed with spiritual weapons, he might afterwards say with confidence, 'the arms of our warfare are not carnal but mighty unto God.' ' [St. Hieron. *de stud. Script.* ad Paulin. *ep.* LIII., 3.] Let all, therefore especially the novices of the ecclesiastical army, understand how deeply the Sacred Books should be esteemed, and with what eagerness and reverence they should approach this great arsenal of heavenly arms. For those whose duty it is to handle Catholic doctrine before the learned or the unlearned will nowhere find more ample matter or more abundant exhortation, whether on the subject of God, the supreme Good and the all-perfect Being, or the works which display His glory and His love. Nowhere is there anything more full or more express on the subject of the Saviour of the world than is to be found in the whole range of the Bible. As St. Jerome says, 'to be ignorant of the Scripture is not to know Christ.' [*in Isaiam Prol.*] In its pages His Image stands out, living and breathing; diffusing everywhere around consolation in trouble, encouragement to virtue and attraction to the love of God. And as to the Church, her institutions, her nature, her office and her gifts, we find in Holy Scripture so many references and so many ready and convincing arguments, that as St. Jerome again most truly says. 'A man who is well grounded in the testimonies of the Scripture is the bulwark of the Church.' [*in Isaiam* LIV. 12.] And if we come to morality and discipline, an apostolic man finds in the Sacred Writings abundant and excellent assistance; most holy precepts, gentle and strong exhortation, splendid examples of every virtue, and finally the

promise of eternal reward and the threat of eternal punishment, uttered in terms of solemn import, in God's name and in God's own words.

"And it is this peculiar and singular power of Holy Scripture, arising from the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, which gives authority to the sacred orator, fills him with apostolic liberty of speech, and communicates force and power to his eloquence. For those who infuse into their efforts the spirit and strength of the Word of God, speak 'not in word only, but in power also, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much fulness.' [I Thess. I., 5]. Hence, those preachers are foolish and improvident who, in speaking of religion and proclaiming the things of God, use no words but those of human science and human prudence, trusting to their own reasonings rather than to those of God. Their discourses may be brilliant and fine, but they must be feeble and they must be cold, for they are without the fire of the utterance of God [Jerem. XXIII., 29] and they must fall far short of that mighty power which the speech of God possesses: 'for the Word of God is living and effectual, and more piercing than any two-edged sword; and reaching unto the division of the soul and the spirit.' [Hebr. IV., 12]. But, indeed those who have a right to speak are agreed that there is in the Holy Scripture an eloquence that is wonderfully varied and rich and worthy of great themes. This St. Augustine thoroughly understood and has abundantly set forth. [*De doctr. Chr.* IV., 6, 7.] This, also, is confirmed by the best preachers of all ages, who have gratefully acknowledged that they owed their repute chiefly to the assiduous use of the Bible, and to devout meditation on its pages.

"The Holy Fathers well knew all this by practical experience, and they never cease to extol the Sacred Scripture and its fruits. In innumerable passages of their writings we find them applying to it such phrases as 'an inexhaustible treasury of heavenly doctrine,' [S. Chrys. in *Gen. Hom.* XXI., 2; *Hom.* IX., 3; S. Aug. *de Disc. Christ.* II.] or 'an overflowing fountain of salvation,' [S. Athan. *ep. fest.* XXXIX.] or putting it before us as fertile pastures and beautiful gardens in which the flock of the Lord is marvellously refreshed and

delighted. [S. Aug. *serm.* XXVI., 24; S. Ambr. *in Ps.* CXVIII., *serm.* XIX., 2] Let us listen to the words of St. Jerome, in his Epistle to Nepotian: 'Often read the divine Scriptures; yea, let holy reading be always in thy hand; study that which thou thyself must preach. . . . Let the speech of the priest be ever seasoned with Scriptural reading.' [S. Hier. *de vita cleric.* ad Nepot.] St Gregory the Great, than whom no one has more admirably described the pastoral office, writes in the same sense: 'Those,' he says, 'who are zealous in the work of preaching must never cease the study of the Written Word of God.' [S. Greg. M., *Regul. past.* II., 11. (al. 22); *Moral.* XVII., 26 (al. 14). St. Augustine, however, warns us that 'vainly does the preacher utter the Word of God exteriorly unless he listens to it interiorly;' [S. Aug. *serm.* CLXXIX., 1.] and St. Gregory instructs sacred orators 'first to find in Holy Scripture the knowledge of themselves, and then carry it to others, lest in reproving others they forget themselves.' [S. Greg. M. *Regul. past.*, III., 24 (al. 14).] Admonitions such as these had, indeed, been uttered long before by the Apostolic voice which had learnt its lesson from Christ Himself, Who 'began to do and teach.' It was not to Timothy alone, but to the whole order of the clergy, that the command was addressed: 'Take heed to thyself and to doctrine; be earnest in them. For in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.' [I. Tim. IV., 16.] For the saving and for the perfection of ourselves and of others there is at hand the very best of help in the Holy Scriptures, as the Book of Psalms, among others, so constantly insists; but those only will find it who bring to this divine reading not only docility and attention, but also piety and an innocent life. For the sacred Scripture is not like other books. Dictated by the Holy Ghost, it contains things of the deepest importance, which, in many instances are most difficult and obscure. To understand and explain such things there is always required the 'coming' [S. Hier. *in Mic.* I., 10.] of the same Holy Spirit; that is to say, His light and His grace, and these, as the Royal Psalmist so frequently insists, are to be sought by humble prayer and guarded by holiness of life.

WHAT THE BIBLE OWES TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

“It is in this that the watchful eye of the Church shines forth conspicuously. By admirable laws and regulations, she has shown herself solicitous that ‘the celestial treasure of the Sacred Books, so bountifully bestowed upon man by the Holy Spirit, should not lie neglected.’ [Conc. Trid. *sess.* V. *decret. de reform.* I.] She has prescribed that a considerable portion of them shall be read and piously reflected upon by all her ministers in the daily office of the sacred psalmody. She has ordered that in cathedral churches, in monasteries, and in other convents in which study can conveniently be pursued, they shall be expounded and interpreted by capable men; and she has strictly commanded that her children shall be fed with the saving words of the Gospel at least on Sundays and solemn feasts. [*Ibid.* 1—2.] Moreover, it is owing to the wisdom and exertions of the Church that there has always been continued, from century to century that cultivation of Holy Scripture which has been so remarkable and has borne such ample fruit.

“And here, in order to strengthen Our teaching and Our exhortations, it is well to recall how, from the beginning of Christianity, all who have been renowned for holiness of life and sacred learning, have given their deep and constant attention to Holy Scripture. If we consider the immediate disciples of the Apostles, St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius of Antioch, St. Polycarp—or the apologists, such as St. Justin and St. Irenæus, we find that in their letters and books, whether in defence of the Catholic Faith or in its commendation, they drew faith, strength, and unction from the Word of God. When there arose, in various Sees, catechetical and theological schools, of which the most celebrated were those of Alexandria and of Antioch, there was little taught in those schools but what was contained in the reading, the interpretation and the defence of the divine written word. From them came forth numbers of Fathers and writers whose laborious studies and admirable writings have justly merited for the three following centuries the appellation of the golden age of biblical exegesis. In the Eastern Church the greatest

name of all is Origen—a man remarkable alike for penetration of genius and persevering labor; from whose numerous works and his great *Hexapla* almost all have drawn who came after him. Others who have widened the field of this science may also be named, as especially eminent; thus, Alexandria could boast of St. Clement and St. Cyril; Palestine, of Eusebius and the other St. Cyril; Cappadocia, of St. Basil the Great and the two Gregories, of Nazianzus and Nyssa; Antioch, of St. John Chrysostom, in whom the science of Scripture was rivalled by the splendor of his eloquence. In the Western Church there are as many names as great: Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, St. Leo the Great, St. Gregory the Great; most famous of all, St. Augustine and St. Jerome, of whom the former was so marvellously acute in penetrating the sense of God's Word and so fertile in the use that he made of it for the promotion of the Catholic truth, and the latter has received from the Church, by reason of his pre-eminent knowledge of Scripture and his labors in promoting its use, the name of the 'great Doctor.' [See the Collect on his feast, September 30.] From this period down to the eleventh century, although biblical studies did not flourish with the same vigor and the same fruitfulness as before, yet they did flourish, and principally by the instrumentality of the clergy. It was their care and solicitude that selected the best and most useful things that the ancients had left, arranged them in order, and published them with additions of their own—as did S. Isidore of Seville, Venerable Bede, and Alcuin, among the most prominent; it was they who illustrated the sacred pages with 'glosses' or short commentaries, as we see in Walafrid Strabo and St. Anselm of Laon, or expended fresh labor in securing their integrity, as did St. Peter Damian and Blessed Lanfranc. In the twentieth century many took up, with great success, the allegorical exposition of Scripture. In this kind, St. Bernard is preeminent; and his writings, it may be said, are Scripture all through. With the age of the scholastics came fresh and welcome progress in the study of the Bible. That the scholastics were solicitous about the genuineness of the Latin version is evident from the *Correctoria Biblica*, or list

of emendations, which they have left. But they expended their labors and industry chiefly on interpretation and explanation. To them we owe the accurate and clear distinction, such as had not been given before, of the various senses of the sacred words; the assignment of the value of each 'sense' in theology; the division of books into parts, and the summaries of the various parts; the investigation of the objects of the writers; the demonstration of the connection of sentence with sentence, and clause with clause; all of which is calculated to throw much light on the more obscure passages of the Sacred Volume. The valuable work of the scholastics in Holy Scripture is seen in their theological treatises and in their Scripture commentaries; and in this respect the greatest name among them all is St. Thomas Aquinas.

"When our predecessor, Clement V., established chairs of Oriental literature in the Roman College and in the principal Universities of Europe, Catholics began to make more accurate investigation on the original text of the Bible as well as on the Latin version. The revival amongst us of Greek learning, and, much more, the happy invention of the art of printing, gave a strong impetus to biblical studies. In a brief space of time, innumerable editions, especially of the Vulgate, poured from the press and were diffused throughout the Catholic world; so honored and loved was Holy Scripture during that very period against which the enemies of the Church direct their calumnies. Nor must we forget how many learned men there were, chiefly among the religious orders, who did excellent work for the Bible between the Council of Vienna and that of Trent; men who, by the employment of modern means and appliances, and by the tribute of their own genius and learning, not only added to the rich store of ancient times, but prepared the way for the succeeding century, the century which followed the Council of Trent, when it almost seemed that the great age of the Fathers had returned. For it is well-known, and We recall it with pleasure, that Our predecessors from Pius IV. to Clement VIII. caused to be prepared the celebrated editions of the Vulgate and the Septuagint, which, having been pub-

lished by the command and authority of Sixtus V. and of the same Clement, are now in common use. At this time, moreover, were carefully brought out various other ancient versions of the Bible, and the Polyglots of Antwerp and of Paris, most important for the investigation of the true meaning of the text; nor is there any one book of either Testament which did not find more than one expositor, nor any grave question which did not profitably exercise the ability of many inquirers, among whom there are not a few—more especially of those who made most use of the Fathers—who have acquired great reputation. From that time downwards the labor and solicitude of Catholics have never been wanting; for, as time went on, eminent scholars have carried on biblical study with success, and have defended Holy Scripture against *rationalism* with the same weapons of philology and kindred sciences with which it had been attacked. The calm and fair consideration of what has been said will clearly show that the Church has never failed in taking due measures to bring the Scriptures within reach of her children, and that she has ever held fast and exercised profitably that guardianship conferred upon her by Almighty God for the protection and glory of His Holy Word; so that she has never required, nor does she now require any stimulation from without.

HOW TO STUDY HOLY SCRIPTURE.

“We must now, Venerable Brethren, as our purpose demands, impart to you such counsels as seem best suited for carrying on successfully the study of biblical science.

“But first it must be clearly understood whom we have to oppose and contend against, and what are their tactics and their arms. In earlier times the contest was chiefly with those who, relying on private judgment and repudiating the divine traditions and teaching office of the Church, held the Scriptures to be the one source of revelation and the final appeal in matters of faith. Now we have to meet the Rationalists, *true children and inheritors of the older heretics*, who, trusting in their turn to their own way of thinking, have rejected even the scraps and remnants of Christian belief which

had been handed down to them. They deny that there is any such thing as revelation or inspiration, or Holy Scripture at all; they see, instead, only the forgeries and falsehoods of men; they set down the Scripture narratives as stupid fables and lying stories: the prophecies and oracles of God are to them either predictions made up after the event or forecasts formed by the light of nature; the miracles and wonders of God's power are not what they are said to be, but the startling effects of natural law, or else mere tricks and myths; and the Apostolic Gospels and writings are not the work of the apostles at all. These detestable errors, whereby they think they destroy the truth of the divine books, are obtruded on the world as the peremptory pronouncements of a newly invented 'free science,' a science, however, which is so far from final that they are perpetually modifying and supplementing it. And there are some of them, who, notwithstanding their impious opinions and utterances about God, and Christ, the Gospels and the rest of Holy Scripture, would fain be considered both theologians and Christians and men of the Gospel, and who attempt to disguise by such honorable names their rashness and their pride. To them we must add not a few professors of other sciences who approve their views and give them assistance, and are urged to attack the Bible by similar intolerance of revelation. And it is deplorable to see these attacks growing every day more numerous and more severe. It is sometimes men of learning and judgment who are assailed; but these have little difficulty in defending themselves from evil consequences. The efforts and arts of the enemy are chiefly directed against the more ignorant masses of the people. They diffuse their deadly poison by means of books, pamphlets, and newspapers; they spread it by addresses and by conversation; they are found *everywhere*; and they are in possession of numerous schools, taken by violence from the Church, in which, by ridicule and scurrilous jesting, they pervert the credulous and unformed minds of the young to the contempt of Holy Scripture. Should not these things, Venerable Brethren, stir up and set on fire the heart of every pastor, so that to this 'knowledge, falsely so called,' [1. Tim. IV., 20.] may be opposed the

ancient and true science which the Church, through the Apostles has received from Christ, and that Holy Scripture may find the champions that are needed in so momentous a battle?

“Let our first care, then, be to see that in seminaries and academical institutions the study of Holy Scripture be placed on such a footing as its own importance and the circumstances of the time demand. With this view, the first thing which requires attention is the wise choice of professors. Teachers of Sacred Scripture are not to be appointed at haphazard out of the crowd; but they must be men whose character and fitness are proved by their love of the Bible and their long familiarity with it and by suitable learning and study.

“It is a matter of equal importance to provide in time for a continuous succession of such teachers; and it will be well wherever this can be done, to select young men of good promise who have successfully accomplished their theological course, and to set them apart exclusive for Holy Scripture, affording them facilities for full and complete studies. Professors, thus chosen and thus prepared, may enter, with confidence, on the task that is appointed for them; and that they may carry out their work well and profitably, let them take heed to the instructions we now proceed to give.

“At the commencement of a course of Holy Scripture, let the professor strive earnestly to form the judgment of the young beginners so as to train them equally to defend the Sacred Writings and to penetrate their meaning. This is the object of the treatise which is called ‘Introduction.’ Here the student is taught how to prove the integrity and authority of the Bible, how to investigate and ascertain its true sense, and how to meet and refute objections. It is needless to insist upon the importance of making these preliminary studies in an orderly and thorough fashion, with the accompaniment and assistance of Theology; for the whole subsequent course must rest on the foundation thus laid and make use of the light thus acquired. Next, the teacher will turn his attention to that more fruitful division of Scripture science which has to do with interpretation, wherein is

imparted the method of using the Word of God for the advantage of religion and piety. We recognize, without hesitation, that neither the extent of the matter nor the time at disposal allows each single Book of the Bible to be separately gone through. But the teaching should result in a definite and ascertained method of interpretation—and, therefore, the professor should equally avoid the mistake of giving a mere taste of every Book, and of dwelling at too great a length on a part of one Book. If most schools cannot do what is done in large institutions—take the students through the whole of one or two Books continuously and with a certain development—yet at least those parts which are selected should be treated with suitable fulness; in such a way that the students may learn from the sample that is put before them to love and use the remainder of the Sacred Book during the whole of their lives. The professor, following the tradition of antiquity, will make use of the Vulgate as his text; for the Council of Trent decreed that ‘in public lectures, disputations, preaching, and exposition,’ [*Sess. IV., decr. de edit. et usu sacr. libror.*] the Vulgate is the ‘authentic’ version; and this is the existing custom of the Church. At the same time, the other versions, which Christian antiquity has approved, should not be neglected, more especially the more ancient MSS. For, although the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek is substantially rendered by the Vulgate, nevertheless, wherever there may be ambiguity or want of clearness, the ‘examination of older tongues,’ [*De doct. chr. III., 4.*] to quote St. Augustine, will be useful and advantageous. But in this matter we need hardly say that the greatest prudence is required, for the ‘office of a commentator,’ as St. Jerome says, ‘is to set forth not what he himself would prefer, but what his author says.’ [*Ad Pammachium.*] The question of ‘reading’ having been, when necessary, carefully discussed, the next thing is to investigate and expound the meaning. And the first counsel to be given is this: that the more our adversaries contend to the contrary, so much the more solicitously should we adhere to the received and approved canons of interpretation. Hence, whilst weighing the meaning of words, the connection of ideas, the parallel-

ism of passages, and the like, we should by all means make use of such illustrations as can be drawn from opposite erudition of an external sort; but this should be done with caution so as not to bestow on questions of this kind more labor and time than are spent on the Sacred Books themselves, and not to overload the minds of the students with a mass of information that will be rather a hindrance than a help.

HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THEOLOGY; INTERPRETATION;
THE FATHERS.

“The professor may now safely pass on to the use of Scripture in matters of theology. On this head it must be observed that, in addition to the usual reasons which make ancient writings more or less difficult to understand, there are some which are peculiar to the Bible. For the language of the Bible is employed to express, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, many things which are beyond the power and scope of the reason of man—that is to say, Divine mysteries and all that is related to them. There is sometimes in such passages a fulness and a hidden depth of meaning which the letter hardly expresses and which the laws of interpretation hardly warrant. Moreover, the literal sense itself frequently admits other senses, adapted to illustrate dogma or to confirm morality. Wherefore, it must be recognized that the Sacred Writings are wrapped in a certain religious obscurity, and that no one can enter into their interior without a guide; [S. Hier. ad. Paulin. *de studio Script. ep.* LIII., 4.] God so disposing, as the holy Fathers commonly teach, in order that men may investigate them with greater ardor and earnestness, and that what is attained with difficulty may sink more deeply into the mind and heart, and, most of all, that they may understand that God has delivered the Holy Scripture to the Church, and that in reading and making use of His Word, they must follow the Church as their guide and their teacher. St. Irenæus long since laid down, that where the *charismata* of God were, there the truth was to be learnt, and the Holy Scripture was safely interpreted by those who had the Apostolic succession. [C. *haer.* IV. 26, 5.] His teaching and that of other holy Fathers, is

taken up by the Council of the Vatican, which, in renewing the decree of Trent declared its 'mind' to be this—that 'in things of faith and morals, belonging to the building up of Christian doctrine, that is to be considered the true sense of Holy Scripture, which has been held and is held by our Holy Mother the Church, whose place it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; and, therefore, that it is permitted to no one to interpret Holy Scripture against such sense or also against the unanimous agreement of the Fathers.' [*Sess. III., cap. II., de revel.; cf. Conc. Trid. sess. IV. decret. de edit. et usu sacr. libror.*] By this most wise decree the Church by no means prevents or restrains the pursuit of Biblical science, but rather protects it from error, and largely assists its real progress. A wide field is still left open to the private student, in which his hermeneutical skill may display itself with signal effect and to the advantage of the Church. On the one hand, in those passages of Holy Scripture, which have not as yet received a certain and definite interpretation, such labors may, in the benignant providence of God, prepare for and bring to maturity the judgment of the Church; on the other, in passages already defined, the private student may do work equally valuable, either by setting them forth more clearly to the flock or more skillfully to the scholars, or by defending them more powerfully from hostile attack. Wherefore the first and dearest object of the Catholic commentator should be to interpret those passages which have received an authentic interpretation either from the Sacred writers themselves, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost (as in many places of the New Testament), or from the Church, under the assistance of the same Holy Spirit, whether by her solemn judgment or her ordinary and universal *magisterium* [*Conc. Vat. sess. III., cap. II., de fide.*]*—to interpret these passages in that identical sense, and to prove by all the resources of science, that sound hermeneutical laws admit of no other interpretation. In the other passages the analogy of faith should be followed, and Catholic doctrine, as authoritatively proposed by the Church, should be held as the supreme law; for, seeing that the same God is the author both of the*

Sacred Books and of the doctrine committed to the Church, it is clearly impossible that any teaching can, by legitimate means, be extracted from the former, which shall, in any respect, be at variance with the latter. Hence it follows that all interpretation is foolish or false which either makes the Sacred writers disagree one with another, or is opposed to the doctrine of the Church. The professor of Holy Scripture, therefore, amongst other recommendations, must be well acquainted with the whole circle of Theology and deeply read in the commentaries of the Holy Fathers and doctors, and in other interpreters of mark. [*Ibid.*] This is inculcated by St. Jerome, and still more frequently by St. Augustine, who thus justly complains, 'If there is no branch of teaching, however humble and easy to learn, which does not require a master, what can be a greater sign of rashness and pride than to refuse to study the Books of the Divine mysteries by the help of those who have interpreted them?' [Ad Honorat. *de util. cred.* XVII., 35.] The other Fathers have said the same, and have confirmed it by their example, for they 'endeavored to acquire the understanding of the Holy Scriptures not by their own lights and ideas, but from the writing and authority of the ancients, who, in their turn, as we know, received the rule of interpretation in direct line from the Apostles.' [Rufinus *Hist. eccl.* LI., 9.] The holy Fathers 'to whom, after the Apostles, the Church owes its growth—who have planted, watered, built, governed, and cherished it,' [S. Aug. C., Julian. II., 10. 37.] the holy Fathers, We say, are of supreme authority, whenever they all interpret in one and the same manner any text of the Bible, as pertaining to the doctrine of faith and morals; for their unanimity clearly evinces that such interpretation has come down from the Apostles as a matter of Catholic faith. The opinion of the Fathers is also of very great weight when they treat of these matters in their capacity of doctors unofficially; not only because they excel in their knowledge of revealed doctrine and in their acquaintance with many things which are useful in understanding the Apostolic Books, but because they are men of eminent sanctity and of ardent zeal for the truth, on whom God has bestowed a more ample measure of

His light. Wherefore the expositor should make it his duty to follow their footsteps with all reverence, and to use their labors with intelligent appreciation.

“But he must not on that account consider that it is forbidden, when just cause exists, to push inquiry and exposition beyond what the Fathers have done; provided he carefully observes the rule so wisely laid down by St. Augustine—not to depart from the literal and obvious sense, except only where reason makes it untenable or necessity requires; [*De Gen. ad litt.* LVIII. CC., 7. 13.] a rule to which it is the more necessary to adhere strictly in these times, when the thirst for novelty and the unrestrained freedom of thought make the danger of error most real and proximate. Neither should those passages be neglected which the Fathers have understood in an allegorical or figurative sense, more especially when such interpretation is justified by the literal, and when it rests on the authority of many. For this method of interpretation has been received by the Church from the Apostles, and has been approved by her own practice, as the holy Liturgy attests; although it is true that the holy Fathers did not thereby pretend directly to demonstrate dogmas of faith, but used it as a means of promoting virtue and piety, such as, by their own experience, they knew to be most valuable. The authority of other Church interpreters is not so great; but the study of Scripture has always continued to advance in the Church, and, therefore, these commentaries also have their own honorable place, and are serviceable in many ways for the refutation of assailants and the explanation of difficulties. But it is most unbecoming to pass by, in ignorance or contempt, the excellent work which Catholics have left in abundance, and to have recourse to the work of non-Catholics—and to seek in them, to the detriment of sound doctrine and often to the peril of faith, the explanation of passages on which Catholics long ago have successfully employed their talent and their labor. For although the studies of non-Catholics, used with prudence, may sometimes be of use to the Catholic student, he should, nevertheless, bear well in mind—as the Fathers also teach in numerous passages [*Cfr. Clem. Alex. Strom.* VII., 16; *Orig. de princ.*

IV., 8; in *Levit. hom.* 4. 8; Tertull. *de praescr.* 15, *seqq.*; S. Hilar. Pict. in *Matth.* 13. 1.]—that the sense of Holy Scripture can nowhere be found incorrupt outside the Church, and cannot be expected to be found in writers who, being without the true faith, only gnaw the bark of Sacred Scripture, and never attain its pith.

“Most desirable is it, and most essential, that the whole teaching of Theology should be pervaded and animated by the use of the Divine Word of God. This is what the Fathers and the greatest theologians of all ages have desired and reduced to practice. It is chiefly out of the Sacred Writings that they endeavored to proclaim and establish the Articles of Faith and the truths therewith connected, and it was in them, together with Divine Tradition, that they found the refutation of heretical error, and the reasonableness, the true meaning, and the mutual relation of the truths of Catholicism. Nor will any one wonder at this who considers that the Sacred Books hold such an eminent position among the sources of revelation that without their assiduous study and use, Theology cannot be placed on a true footing, or treated as its dignity demands. For although it is right and proper that students in academies and schools should be chiefly exercised in acquiring a scientific knowledge of dogma by means of reasoning from the Articles of Faith to their consequences, according to the rules of approved and sound philosophy—nevertheless the judicious and instructed theologians will by no means pass by that method of doctrinal demonstration which draws its proof from the authority of the Bible; ‘for (Theology) does not receive her first principles from any other science, but immediately from God by revelation. And, therefore, she does not receive of other sciences as from a superior, but uses them as her inferiors or hand maids.’ [S., Greg. M. *Moral.* XX., 9 (al. 11).] It is this view of doctrinal teaching which is laid down and recommended by the prince of theologians, St. Thomas of Aquin; [*Summ. theol.* p. I., q. I., a. 5 ad 2.] who moreover shows—such being the essential character of Christian Theology—how she can defend her own principles against attack: ‘If the adversary,’ he says, ‘do but grant any portion of the Divine

revelation, we have an argument against him; thus, against a heretic we can employ Scripture authority, and against those who deny one article, we can use another. But if our opponent reject Divine revelation entirely, there is no way left to prove the Articles of Faith by reasoning; we can only solve the difficulties which are raised against them.' [*Ibid* a. 8.] Care must be taken, then, that beginners approach the study of the Bible well prepared and furnished; otherwise, just hopes will be frustrated, or, perchance, what is worse, they will unthinkingly risk the danger of error, falling an easy prey to the sophisms and labored erudition of the Rationalists. The best preparation will be a conscientious application to philosophy and theology under the guidance of St. Thomas of Aquin, and a thorough training therein—as We ourselves have elsewhere pointed out and directed. By this means, both in Biblical studies and in that part of Theology which is called *positive*, they will pursue the right path and make satisfactory progress.

THE AUTHORITY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE; MODERN
CRITICISM; PHYSICAL SCIENCE.

“To prove, to expound, to illustrate Catholic doctrine by the legitimate and skillful interpretation of the Bible is much; but there is a second part of the subject of equal importance and equal difficulty—the maintenance in the strongest possible way of its full authority. This cannot be done completely or satisfactorily except by means of the living and proper *magisterium* of the Church. The Church by reason of her wonderful propagation, her distinguished sanctity, and inexhaustible fecundity in good, her Catholic unity, and her unshaken stability, is herself a great and perpetual motive of credibility, and an unassailable testimony to her own Divine mission.’ [Conc. Vat. sess. III. c. II. *de fide*.] But since the divine and infallible *magisterium* of the Church rests also on Holy Scripture; the first thing to be done is to vindicate the trustworthiness of Sacred records, at least as human documents, from which can be clearly proved, as from primitive and authentic testimony, the Divinity and the mission of Christ our Lord, the institution of a hierarchi-

cal Church and the primacy of Peter and of his successors. It is most desirable, therefore, that there should be numerous members of the clergy well prepared to enter on a contest of this nature, and to repulse hostile assaults, chiefly trusting in the armor of God recommended by the Apostle, [Eph. VI., 13, *seqq.*] but also not unaccustomed to modern methods of attack. This is beautifully alluded to by St. John Chrysostom, when describing the duties of priests: 'We must use every endeavor that the 'Word of God may dwell in us abundantly' [Cfr., *Coloss.* III., 16.] not merely for one kind of a fight must we be prepared—for the contest is many-sided and the enemy is of every sort; and they do not all use the same weapons nor make their onset in the same way. Wherefore it is needful that the man who has to contend against all should be acquainted with the engines and the arts of all—that he should be at once archer and slinger, commandant and officer, general and private soldier, foot-soldier and horseman, skilled in sea-fight and in siege; for unless he knows every trick and turn of war, the devil is well able, if only a single door be left open, to get in his fierce bands and carry off the sheep.' [*De Sacerdotio* IV., 4.] The sophisms of the enemy and his manifold arts of attack we have already touched upon. Let us now say a word of advice on the means of defence. The first means is the study of the Oriental languages and of the art of criticism. These two acquirements are in these days held in high estimation, and, therefore, the clergy, by making themselves fully acquainted with them as time and place may demand, will the better be able to discharge their office with becoming credit; for they must make themselves 'all to all,' [I. Cor. IX., 22.] always 'ready to satisfy every one that asketh them a reason for the hope that is in them.' [I. Peter III., 25.] Hence it is most proper that professors of Sacred Scripture and theologians should master those tongues in which the Sacred Books were originally written; and it would be well that Church students also should cultivate them, more especially those who aspire to academic degrees. And endeavors should be made to establish in all academic institutions—as has already been laudably done in many—chairs

of the other ancient languages, especially the Semitic, and of subjects connected therewith, for the benefit, principally, of those who are intended to profess Sacred literature. These latter, with a similar object in view, should make themselves well and thoroughly acquainted with the art of true criticism. There has arisen, to the great detriment of religion, an inept method, dignified by the name of the 'higher criticism,' which pretends to judge the origin, integrity and authority of each Book from internal indications alone. It is clear on the other hand, that in historical questions, such as the origin and handing down of writings, the witness of history is of primary importance, and that historical investigation should be made with the utmost care; and that in this matter internal evidence is seldom of great value, except as confirmation. To look upon it in any other light will be to open the door to many evil consequences. It will make the enemies of religion much more bold and confident in attacking and mangling the Sacred Books; and this vaunted 'higher criticism' will resolve itself into the reflection of the bias and the prejudice of the critics. It will not throw on the Scripture the light which is sought, or prove of any advantage to doctrine; it will only give rise to disagreement and dissension, those sure notes of error, which the critics in question so plentifully exhibit in their own persons; and seeing that most of them are tainted with false philosophy and rationalism, it must lead to the elimination from the Sacred Writings of all prophecy and miracle, and of everything else that is outside the natural order.

"In the second place, we have to contend against those who, making an evil use of physical science, minutely scrutinize the Sacred Books in order to detect the writers in a mistake, and to take occasion to vilify its contents. Attacks of this kind, bearing as they do on matters of sensible experience, are peculiarly dangerous to the masses, and also to the young who are beginning their literary studies; for the young, if they lose their reverence for the Holy Scripture on one or more points, are easily led to give up believing in it altogether. It need not be pointed out how the nature of science, just as it is so admirably adapted to show forth the

glory of the Great Creator, provided it is taught as it should be, so, if it be perversely imparted to the youthful intelligence, it may prove most fatal in destroying the principles of true philosophy and in the corruption of morality. Hence, to the professor of Sacred Scripture a knowledge of natural science will be of very great assistance in detecting such attacks on the Sacred Books, and in refuting them. There can never, indeed, be any real discrepancy between the theologian and the physicist, as long as each confines himself within his own lines, and both are careful, as St. Augustine warns us, 'not to make rash assertions, or to assert what is not known as known.' [*In. Gen. op. imperf.* IX., 30.] If dissension should arise between them, here is the rule also laid down by St. Augustine, for the theologian: 'whatever they can really demonstrate to be true of physical nature, we must show to be capable of reconciliation with our Scriptures; and whatever they assert in their treatises, which is contrary to these Scriptures of ours, that is to Catholic faith, we must either prove it as well as we can to be entirely false, or at all events we must, without the smallest hesitation, believe it to be so.' [*De Gen. ad litt.*, I., 21—41.] To understand how just is the rule here formulated we must remember, first, that the Sacred writers, or to speak more accurately, the Holy Ghost 'Who spoke by them, did not intend to teach men these things (that is to say, the essential nature of the things of the visible universe), things is no way profitable unto salvation.' [*S. Aug. ib.* II., 9—20.] Hence they did not seek to penetrate the secrets of nature, but rather described and dealt with things in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time, and which in many instances are in daily use at this day, even by the most eminent men of science. Ordinary speech primarily and properly describes what comes under the senses; and somewhat in the same way the Sacred writers—as the Angelic Doctor also reminds us—'went by what sensibly appeared,' [*Summa theol.* p. i. q. LXXX., a. 1. ad 3.] or put down what God, speaking to men, signified, in the way men could understand and were accustomed to.

"The unshrinking defence of the Holy Scripture, however, does not require that we should equally uphold all the opinions which each of the Fathers or the more recent interpreters have put forth in explaining it; for it may be that, in commenting on passages where physical matters occur, they have sometimes expressed the ideas of their own times, and thus made statements which in these days have been abandoned as incorrect. Hence, in their interpretations, we must carefully note what they lay down as belonging to faith, or as intimately connected with faith—what they are unanimous in. For 'in those things which do not come under the obligation of faith, the saints were at liberty to hold divergent opinions, just as we ourselves are,' [*In Sent.* II., Dist. II., q. I., a. 3.] according to the saying of St. Thomas. And in another place he says most admirably: 'when philosophers are agreed upon a point, and it is not contrary to our faith, it is safer, in my opinion, neither to lay down such a point as a dogma of faith, even though it is perhaps so presented by the philosophers, nor to reject it as against faith, lest we thus give to the wise of this world an occasion of despising our faith.' [*Opusc.* X.] The Catholic interpreter, although he should show that those facts of natural science which investigators affirm to be now quite certain are not contrary to the Scripture rightly explained, must, nevertheless, always bear in mind, that much which has been held and proved as certain has afterwards been called in question and rejected. And if writers on physics travel outside the boundaries of their own branch, and carry their erroneous teaching into the domain of philosophy, let them be handed over to philosophers for refutation.

INSPIRATION INCOMPATIBLE WITH ERROR.

"The principles here laid down will apply to cognate sciences and especially to history. It is a lamentable fact that there are many who with great labor carry out and publish investigations on the monuments of antiquity, the manners and institutions of nations and other illustrative subjects, and whose chief purpose in all this is to find mistakes in the Sacred Writings and so to shake and weaken

their authority. Some of these writers display not only extreme hostility, but the greatest unfairness; in their eyes a profane book or ancient document is accepted without hesitation, whilst the Scripture, if they only find in it a suspicion of error, is set down with the slightest possible discussion as quite untrustworthy. It is true, no doubt, that copyists have made mistakes in the text of the Bible; this question, when it arises, should be carefully considered on its merits, and the fact not too easily admitted, but only in those passages where the proof is clear. It may also happen that the sense of a passage remains ambiguous, and in this case good hermeneutical methods will greatly assist in clearing up the obscurity. But it is absolutely wrong and forbidden, either to narrow inspiration to certain parts only of Holy Scripture, or to admit that the Sacred Writer has erred. For the system of those who, in order to rid themselves of those difficulties, do not hesitate to concede that Divine inspiration regards the things of faith and morals, and nothing beyond, because (as they wrongly think), in a question of the truth or falsehood of a passage, we should consider not so much what God has said as the reason and purpose which He had in mind when saying it—this system cannot be tolerated. For all the Books which the Church receives as sacred and canonical are written wholly and entirely, with all their parts, at the dictation of the Holy Ghost; and so far is it from being possible that any error can co-exist with inspiration, that inspiration not only is essentially incompatible with error, but excludes and rejects it as absolutely and necessarily as it is impossible that God Himself, the Supreme Truth, can utter that which is not true. This is the ancient and unchanging faith of the Church solemnly defined in the councils of Florence and of Trent, and finally confirmed and more expressly formulated by the Council of the Vatican. These are the words of the last: 'The Books of the Old and New Testament, whole and entire, with all their parts, as enumerated by the decree of the same Council (Trent) and in the ancient Latin Vulgate, are to be received as Sacred and Canonical. And the Church holds them as Sacred and Canonical, not because having

been composed by human industry, they were afterwards approved by her authority; nor only because they contain revelation without error; but because, having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their Author.' [Sess. III. C. II., *de Rev.*] Hence, because the Holy Ghost employed men as His instruments, we cannot, therefore, say that it was these inspired instruments who, perchance, have fallen into error, and not the primary Author. For, by supernatural power, He so moved and impelled them to write—He was so present to them—that the things which He ordered, and those only, they, first, rightly understood, then willed faithfully to write down, and finally expressed in apt words and with infallible truth. Otherwise, it could not be said that He was the Author of the entire Scripture. Such has always been the persuasion of the Fathers. 'Therefore,' says St. Augustine, 'since they wrote the things which He showed and uttered to them, it cannot be pretended that He is not the Writer; for His members executed what their Head dictates.' [*De consensu Evangel.* L. 1, C. 35.] And St. Gregory the Great thus pronounces: 'most superfluous it is to inquire who wrote these things—we loyally believe the Holy Ghost to be the author of the Book. He wrote it Who dictated it for writing; He wrote it Who inspired its execution.' [*Praef. in Job*, n. 2.]

"It follows that those who maintain that an error is possible in any genuine passage of the Sacred Writings, either pervert the Catholic notion of inspiration, or make God the author of such error. And so emphatically were all the Fathers and Doctors agreed that the Divine Writings, as left by the hagiographers, are free from all error, that they labored earnestly, with no less skill than reverence, to reconcile with each other those numerous passages which seem at variance—the very passages which in a great measure have been taken up by the 'higher criticism'; for they were unanimous in laying it down, that those writings, in their entirety and in all their parts were equally from the *afflatus* of Almighty God, and that God, speaking by the Sacred Writers, could not set down anything that was not true. The words

of St. Augustine to St. Jerome may sum up what they taught: 'On my own part I confess to your charity that it is only to those books of Scripture which are now called canonical that I have learned to pay such honor and reverence as to believe most firmly that none of their writers has fallen into any error. And if in these Books I meet anything which seems contrary to truth, I shall not hesitate to conclude either that the text is faulty, or that the translator has not expressed the meaning of the passage, or that I myself do not understand.' [*Ep. LXXVII., 1, et crebrius alibi.*]

"But to undertake fully and perfectly, and with all the weapons of the best science, the defence of the Holy Bible is far more than can be looked for from the exertion of commentators and theologians alone. It is an enterprise in which we have a right to expect the co-operation of all those Catholics who have acquired reputation in any branch of learning whatever. As in the past, so at the present time, the Church is never without the graceful support of her accomplished children; may their service to the Faith grow and increase! For there is nothing which We believe to be more needful than that truth should find defenders more powerful and more numerous than the enemies it has to face; nor is there anything which is better calculated to impress the masses with respect for truth than to see it boldly proclaimed by learned and distinguished men. Moreover, the bitter tongues of objectors will be silenced, or at least they will not dare to insist so shamelessly that faith is the enemy of science, when they see that scientific men of eminence in their profession show towards faith the most marked honor and respect. Seeing, then, that those can do so much for the advantage of religion on whom the goodness of Almighty God has bestowed, together with the grace of the faith, great natural talent, let such men, in this bitter conflict of which the Holy Scripture is the object, select each of them the branch of study most suitable to his circumstances, and endeavor to excel therein, and thus be prepared to repulse with credit and distinction the assaults on the Word of God. And it is Our pleasing duty to give deserved praise to a work which certain Catholics

have taken up—that is to say, the formation of societies and the contribution of considerable sums of money, for the purpose of supplying studious and learned men with every kind of help and assistance in carrying out complete studies. Truly an excellent fashion of investing money, and well suited to the times in which we live! The less hope of public patronage there is for Catholic study, the more ready and the more abundant should be the liberality of private persons—those to whom God has given riches thus willingly making use of their means to safeguard the treasure of His revealed doctrine.

SUMMARY.

“In order that all these endeavors and exertions may really prove advantageous to the cause of the Bible, let scholars keep steadfastly to the principles which We have in this Letter laid down: Let them loyally hold that God, the Creator and Ruler of all things, is also the Author of the Scriptures—and that, therefore, nothing can be proved either by physical science or archæology which can really contradict the Scriptures. If, then, apparent contradiction be met with, every effort should be made to remove it. Judicious theologians and commentators should be consulted as to what is the true or most probable meaning of the passage in discussion, and hostile arguments should be carefully weighed. Even if the difficulty is after all not cleared up, and the discrepancy seems to remain, the contest must not be abandoned; truth cannot contradict truth, and we may be sure that some mistake has been made either in the interpretation of the Sacred Words, or in the polemical discussion itself; and if no such mistake can be detected, we must then suspend judgment for the time being. There have been objections without number perseveringly directed against the Scripture for many a long year, which have been proved to be futile and are now never heard of; and not infrequently interpretations have been placed on certain passages of Scripture (not belonging to the rule of faith or morals) which have been rectified by more careful investigations. As time goes on, mistaken views die and

disappear; but 'truth remaineth and groweth stronger forever and ever.' [3 Esdr. IV., 38.] Wherefore, as no one should be so presumptuous as to think that he understands the whole of the Scripture, in which St. Augustine himself confessed there was more that he did not know, than that he knew, [Ad Ianuar. *ep.* LV., 21] so, if he should come on anything that seems incapable of solution, he must take to heart the cautious rule of the same holy Doctor: 'It is better even to be oppressed by unknown but useful signs, than to interpret them uselessly and thus to throw off the yoke only to be caught in the trap of error.' [*De doctr. chr.* III., 9, 18].

"As to those who pursue the subsidiary studies of which We have spoken, if they honestly and modestly follow the counsel we have given—if by their pen and their voice they make their studies profitable against the enemies of truth, and useful in saving the young from the loss of their faith—they may justly congratulate themselves on their worthy service to the Sacred Writings, and on affording to Catholicism that assistance which the Church has a right to expect from the piety and learning of her children.

"Such, Venerable Brethren, are the admonitions and the instructions which, by the help of God, We have thought it well, at the present moment to offer to you on the study of Holy Scripture. It will now be your province to see that what We have said be observed and put in practice with all due reverence and exactness; that so, We may prove our gratitude to God for the communication to man of the Words of His Wisdom, and that all the good results so much to be desired may be realized, especially as they affect the training of the students of the Church, which is our own great solicitude and the Church's hope. Exert yourself with willing alacrity, and use your authority and your persuasion in order that these studies may be held in just regard and may flourish in Seminaries and in educational institutions which are under your jurisdiction. Let them flourish in completeness and in happy success, under the direction of the Church, in accordance with the salutary teaching and example of the Holy Fathers, and the laudable traditions

of antiquity; and, as time goes on, let them be widened and extended as the interests and glory of truth may require—the interests of that Catholic Truth, which comes from above, the never-failing source of man's salvation. Finally, We admonish with paternal love, all students and ministers of the Church always to approach the Sacred Writings with reverence and piety; for it is impossible to attain to the profitable understanding thereof unless the arrogance of 'earthly' science be laid aside, and there be excited in the heart the holy desire for that wisdom 'which is from above.' In this way the intelligence, which is once admitted to these Sacred studies, and thereby illuminated and strengthened, will acquire a marvellous facility in detecting and avoiding the fallacies of human science, and in gathering and using for eternal salvation all that is valuable and precious; whilst, at the same time, the heart will grow warm, and will strive, with ardent longing, to advance in virtue and in Divine love. 'Blessed are they who examine His testimonies; they shall seek Him with their whole heart.' [Ps. XVIII., 2].

"And now, filled with hope in the Divine assistance, and trusting to your pastoral solicitude—as a pledge of heavenly grace, and a sign of Our special good will—to you all, and to the Clergy, and to the whole flock entrusted to you, We lovingly impart in Our Lord the Apostolic Benediction.

"Given at St. Peter's, at Rome, the 18th day of November, 1893, the eighteenth year of Our Pontificate."

POPE LEO XIII.

In common parlance, revelation and inspiration are convertible terms, but, in reality, they differ greatly. Revelation, from *revelare*, means to uncover, unveil, disclose to the view something hidden, and, in the present instance, to make known to the mind a concept not before known. This took place with the Prophets, and in every portion of the Holy Writings where the truths enunciated were impervious to the human understanding, or depended on the free will of God; in fact, wherever the idea portrayed was not acquired by the industry and labor of the writer. When, therefore, the writer expresses truths which he had acquired by the

ordinary method of human research and observation, there is no revelation from God requisite or given. Thus St. Luke tells us that, "it had seemed good to him, who had followed studiously all things from the beginning, to write in order these things." Thus the author of the II. Book of Maccabees testifies, Cap. II. 24—27: "And thus the things that were comprised by Jason the Cyrenean in five volumes, we have attempted to compendiate in one volume. We who have undertaken to compendiate this work, have taken upon ourselves a task abounding in vigils and sweat." This book then is not, properly speaking, revealed. But usage has prevailed and prevails to speak of the whole body of the Scriptures as revealed writings, and we do not wish to correct this usage, but only to define and fix our terms for the greater facility of our treatise. Inspiration then pervades the whole structure of Scripture: it is its formal principle. its soul; revelation is only called in, as we have said, where the writer could not, or, *de facto*, did not acquire his knowledge in the ordinary manner.

This distinction is of great moment, as many difficulties are solved by the same. The neglect of this distinction gave rise to a censure of one of the propositions of the famous Leon Lessius, which, had it been couched in precise terms, would have challenged contradiction. The Holy Ghost, then, is the directing and impelling agent in all the Scripture, but not in the same manner. He discloses the truths unknown before in revelation; he impels to write infallibly the things which God would communicate to man in inspiration. We have defined above the concept of inspiration; we shall now scrutinize more closely its object and extent. The Vatican Council has given us a definition which will serve as our guide in dealing with the present subject, for, as we have proven above, the Church can be the only guide in such a question.

In Cap. II. De Revel. we find:

"Qui quidem veteris et novi Testamenti libri integri cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ejusdem Concilii decreto recensentur, et in veteri vulgata latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis suscipiendi sunt. Eos vero Ecclesia

pro sacris et canonicis habet, non ideo quod sola humana industria concinnati, sua deinde auctoritate sint approbati; nec ideo dumtaxat, quod revelationem sine errore contineant, sed propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiæ traditi sunt." And in Canon IV. De Revelatione:

"Si quis sacræ Scripturæ libros integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout illos sancta Tridentina Synodus recensuit, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, aut eos divinitus inspiratos esse negaverit; anathema sit."

Hence it is of faith that God is the **AUTHOR** of the Sacred Scriptures, and of the *integral books with all their parts*. It is not here asserted that God with his own hand wrote the books materially, but that he is the *Auctor principalis per conscriptores suos*. Now, we shall bear in mind the relation of the author to his work, in weighing and judging of the correctness or falseness of opinions which deal with this subject.

Inspirare is the Latin equivalent for the Greek *θεοπνεύειν*, which word S. Paul uses in his II. Epist. to Tim. III., 16., "*πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος*". It signifies that one is impelled by God, that the Spirit of God is in him, moving him to action and guiding him in that action. Hence, God is the principal author, the principal cause; and the inspired agent in the instrumental cause.

In every action wrought by a creature, there is a concursus of two causes, the *causa prima*, and the *causa secunda*; the Creator and the Creature. We exist by reflected existence, as the moon shines by reflected light. The same act, which brought us into being at our creation, preserves us in that being, and this is what is called the *conservatio in esse*; and the conservative act is all that prevents us from relapsing into the primal absolute chaos. God must then co-operate with his creature in every act, for the second cause must depend on the First Cause *essentially*, and, therefore, in every act, it must be upheld by the conservative power of God.

But there are certain acts where this concursus is more marked and potent on the part of the Creator, and Inspiration is one of these acts.

On this theme Cardinal Manning (*Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, pp. 158—161) writes as follows:

In order to appreciate more exactly the reach of these opinions, it will be well to examine them somewhat more intimately, and to fix the sense of the terms used in the discussion of the subject.

(1.) First, then, comes the word *Inspiration*, which is often confounded with *Revelation*.

Inspiration, in its *first intention*, signifies the action of the Divine Spirit upon the human, that is, upon the intelligence and upon the will. It is an intelligent and vital action of God upon the soul of man; and “inspired” is to be predicated, not of books or truths, but of living agents.

In its *second intention*, it signifies the action of the Spirit of God upon the intelligence and will of man, whereby any one is impelled and enabled to act, or to speak, or to write, in some special way designed by the Spirit of God.

In its still more *special* and *technical intention*, it signifies an action of the Spirit upon men, impelling them to write what God reveals, suggests, or wills that they should write. But inspiration does not necessarily signify revelation, or suggestion of the matter to be written.

(2.) Secondly, *Revelation* signifies the unfolding to the intelligence of man truths which are contained in the intelligence of God, the knowledge of which without such revelation would be impossible. Men may be the subjects of revelation, and not of inspiration; and they might be the subjects of inspiration, and not of revelation.

(3.) Thirdly, *Suggestion*, in the theory of inspiration, signifies the bringing to mind such things as God wills the writer to put in writing. All revelation is suggestion, but not all suggestion revelation; because much that is suggested may be of the natural order, needing no revelation, being already known by natural reason, or by historical tradition and the like.

(4.) Fourthly, by *Assistance* is understood the presence and help of the Holy Spirit, by which the human agent, in full use of his own liberty and powers—such as natural gifts, genius, acquired cultivation, and the like—executes the work which the Divine Inspiration impels him to write.

There are three kinds of *assistance*.

(1.) First, there is the assistance afforded by the Holy Spirit to all the faithful, by which their intelligence is illuminated and their will strengthened, without exempting them from the liability to error.

(2.) Secondly, there is the assistance vouchsafed to the Church diffused throughout the world or congregated in council, or to the person of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, speaking *ex cathedra*, which excludes all liability to error within the sphere of faith and morals, and such facts and truths as attach to them (of which relations the Church is the ultimate judge), but does not extend to the other orders of purely natural science and knowledge.

(3.) Lastly, there is the assistance granted as a '*gratia gratis data*' to the inspired writers of the Holy Scripture which excludes all liability to error in the act of writing not only in matters of faith and morals, but in all matter, of whatsoever kind, which by the inspiration of God they are impelled to write.

The Jesuits, in the '*Theologia Wirceburgensis*,' sum up the subject in the following way:—The authorship of God 'may be conceived in three ways. First, *by special assistance*, which preserves the writer from all error and falsehood. Secondly, *by inspiration*, which impels the writer to the act of writing, without, however, destroying his liberty. Thirdly, *by revelation*, by which truths hitherto unknown are manifested.' They then affirm, 'that God specially inspired the sacred writers with the truths and matter expressed in the sacred books.'

Perhaps it may be more in accordance with the facts of the case to invert the order, and to say that what we call Inspiration, in the special and technical sense, includes the three following operations of the Holy Ghost upon the mind of the sacred writers:—

(1.) First, the impulse to put into writing the matter which God wills they should record.

(2.) Secondly, the suggestion of the matter to be written, whether by revelation of truths not previously known, or

only by prompting of those things which were already within the writer's knowledge.

(3.) Thirdly, the assistance which excludes liability to error in writing all things, whatsoever may be suggested to them by the Spirit of God to be written.

From this follow two corollaries:—

1. That in the Holy Scripture there can be no falsehood or error.

2. That God is the author of all inspired books."

It is declared in the definition of the Vatican Council that God is the *Author* of the books of the Old and New Testaments with all their parts. We also assert that the various inspired writers were *authors* of the respective books which history and tradition attribute to them. Therefore, there is a concursus of two causes here, of two authors. A book may be defined to be a "Contextus sententiarum seu sensuum scripto consignatus." We here denominate *book*, every complete component factor of the Old or New Testament, even though it consist of but a few sentences, as for instance the Epistle to Philemon, consisting of but 25 verses, comprised in one chapter. In every book or writing, there are two elements, the material and the formal element. The formal element comprises the "Complexus" of ideas and judgments signified by the words and propositions in the book. These by some are called the "res et sententiæ"; by others, the "sensa"; by Franzelin, the "Veritates." The material element of the book, "*in fieri*," is the consigning of these veritates to writing. The author of a book needs not necessarily consign the *veritates* to writing. St. Paul employed an amanuensis to commit his teachings to writing in his Epistles, and, yet, he is their author. It is the creations of the soul reflected in a work that denominate an agent an author. Any hand may do the material work, but the mind back of the truths is the factor to which is rightly attributable the authorship.

When we, therefore, assert for God the authorship of the Scriptures, we do not mean to say that he consigned the ideas to writing with his own hand, but that he was the formal cause of the "res et sententiæ," of the "sensa," of

the "veritates." Now the relation of an author to his work is to be measured by the object of the work. In a rhetorical or poetical work, the words and style would be "per se intenta," and, consequently, the work could not be called the creation of any certain author, unless he had per se produced such beauty of diction. But in a book whose scope is to convey truth to the mind, and naught else, the style or the selection of the words would not necessarily need be the effect of the principal author. Provided they be adequate and fitting to convey the truths which he might wish to impart, the book can attain its end, even though the principal cause have no special influence in the selection of words or the style. Now, it is evident that no being can be termed the author of a book, unless he produces the formal element of the book. God is the Author of all the books of Scripture, and, therefore, he produced all the "veritates," or "res et sententiæ" therein contained. These are true and inspired; the other part may be defective. God produced these "res et sententiæ" either by revelation or by inspiration; by revelation, if the truths were impervious to human reason, such as *futura contingentia*, mysteries, or any other truth which the writer could not acquire by natural means; by inspiration always, illumining the mind and moving the will to write all those things and only those things which God wished to communicate to his creature, whether those things were then for the first time known by revelation, or were the acquisitions of human industry and observation. For even in this latter case, the special action of God is necessary to impel the writer to write all and only the things which God wishes written, and to write them infallibly, without the mixture of error.

We see thus that there is always a greater concursus than the concursus generalis in inspiration. God does for the inspired writer more than "conservare in esse." He is the impelling power within him. Sometimes, as was the case with the Prophets, the second agent is thrown into an ecstasy, and his mind is imbued with ideas, in the creation of which he is only the passive agent. Though the inspired writer is always ὑπὸ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου φερόμενος, borne on,

impelled by the Holy Ghost, not always is this impelling force active in the same way. It is different in prophecy than it is in the inspiration which guided the Evangelists in infallibly committing to writing things to which they had been eye-witnesses. Inspiration does not preclude the examining of existing documents, the patient toil and research which always accompany the natural acquisition of knowledge. Moses may have made use of existing documents, when giving an account of Creation. But the certainty of inspiration is not measured by the certainty of these existing documents, nor by the certainty of fallible human observation and research. Always the hand of God is there, guiding, and positively influencing the agent to write all those things, and only those things which God would have written; and this assistance is not merely a negative one, but a positive act exercised in every concept of Holy Writ. Such is the relation of an author to his work, and we know by divine faith that God is the *Author* of the Holy Scriptures.

It may not be amiss here to indicate some of the principal writers on this theme in our times: Franzelin (*De Divina Traditione et Scriptura*, Romae 1882); Ubaldi (*Introductio in Sac. Script.* Romae 1888); Schmid (*De Inspirat. Bibl. Vi et Ratione*, Brixinae 1885); Crets (*De Divina Biblicorum Inspiratione Lovanii* 1886); Holzhey (*Die Inspiration der Heil. Schrift*, München 1895); Zanecchia (*Divina Inspirat.* etc. Romae 1899, Revised 1903); Chauvin (*L'Inspiration des Divines Ecritures*, Paris 1896); Billot (*De Inspirat. Sac. Script.* Romae 1903); Pesch (*De Inspirat. Sacrae Script.* Friburgi 1906).

Of the Abbé's Chauvin's work, the Dublin Review (1897 pp. 215—218) has the following favorable review:

"Although inspiration is very frequently spoken of, yet, like progress, civilisation and liberty, it is rarely understood. The vast majority of those who refer to it do, no doubt, intend to suggest some kind of mysterious influence from on high; but their ideas are vague and indefinite. They think of it as of a dark figure, veiled and hooded, that moves in silence and never reveals its features.

"All will readily admit that inspiration necessarily implies a divine influence. But divine influences are many; and it is a task of unusual delicacy to define that specific influence which constitutes inspiration. There is a divine influence which actively pervades all creation and rules mighty from end to end; but it is not inspiration. We call it law and providence. Another kind of influence enriches man with virtue, and blossoms out into holiness of life; but we name it grace, not inspiration. Even when inspirations of grace are mentioned by theologians, the word has not the same meaning that it bears when we speak of the inspiration of Scripture; for when a man has been inspired to write, we say: 'God speaks thus,' but when a man under the influence of grace makes an act of faith in the Creed, we do not say: 'God believes thus.' God is personally identified with inspiration in a manner very different from that by which He is identified with the works of grace in general. Lastly, it is only by a divine influence that the Church is preserved from error in all her solemn definitions of faith and morals. But here again, this influence is not termed inspiration, but merely assistance. Ecclesiastical definitions, although infallible, are not inspired.

"What, then, is inspiration? What are our means for detecting its presence in this or that particular instance? Before we can venture to answer these questions we must first determine what are the reliable sources of information on the subject; but it is precisely in this preliminary work of determination that discordant voices are making themselves most loudly heard. One company of explorers is content to accept, on the general consent of Christians, the abridged Bible of protestant tradition as being truly inspired. Starting with this assured fact, the discovery of what is meant by inspiration is merely a matter of induction from Biblical phenomena. The chief merit claimed for the system is that it makes the doctrine of Biblical inspiration absolutely secure against every form of literary and scientific analysis. He who believes in the inspiration of Scripture may, with unruffled serenity, admit the presence in the Bible of flagrant contradictions, or gross historical errors, and of

a low moral tone; for, since the Bible is inspired, the more clearly we understand what the Bible actually is, the deeper will be our insight into the nature of inspiration itself. So far removed, then, are the results of analysis from being opposed to the doctrine of inspiration, that they are an essential factor in its due apprehension.

"Another company of searchers after inspiration have been endowed by a merciful heaven with, or have created for themselves, an *a priori* and quite subjective idea of the true nature of inspiration. This idea they employ as a sort of search-light which they steadily flash around, and are then able to inform us of the varying degrees of purity in which inspiration may be found, not only in the several books of Scripture, but also in the literature of the world at large. Unfortunately, the initial idea of inspiration is not uniform, and the results of its application are consequently divergent. In general, however, it seems to be taken for something freshly informing, deeply suggestive, and highly stimulating. The inspired writer is the man with a special message to the world. Hence those solemn disquisitions on the inspiration of our modern prophets, Browning, Tennyson, Ruskin, and Carlyle.

"To readers desirous either of refreshing their memory, or of acquiring clear ideas on this subject, we heartily recommend the Abbé Chauvin's little book. Judged for what it professes to be—an 'essai théologique et critique'—it deserves all praise. Brief as it is, it leaves nothing to be desired on the score of clearness; in dealing with the central points of the doctrine it is fuller, and certainly more able, than many volumes far more pretentious. With acute mind and independent judgment the author has availed himself of the previous labors of Schmid, Crets, d'Hulst, Loisy, Didiot, Brucker, Brandi, Holzhey, and others. He has thus laid under contribution the most recent commentaries and magazine articles on the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*.

"The essay is divided into eight chapters, as follows: The idea of inspiration; its psychology; false theories bearing upon it; true and false tests of inspiration; the proof of Scriptural inspiration; the subject matter of inspiration; the

controversy on verbal inspiration; the consequences of plenary inspiration. Of these chapters, that on the psychology of inspiration is undoubtedly the most important and the best. We are so interested in the essay that, even at the risk of spoiling what the author has done so well, we shall venture on a brief account of this main position.

"Inspiration implies a divine breath or movement by which a man is stirred to write what God wishes to be written. That movement plays along man's intellect, imagination, memory, and will, till man becomes the responsive instrument of the divine purpose. But man is a living instrument, and is moved by God in accordance with his free and living nature, freely and deliberately—often with much painful effort—to the desired goal. Hence the mental gifts, the literary talents and characteristic qualities of each inspired writer are employed, not destroyed, by God. St. Thomas's principle here also stands good: '*Motus primi moventis non recipitur uniformiter in omnibus . . . sed in unoquoque secundum proprium modum.*' We have not space to follow the author in his patient analysis of the divine action on man's several faculties, but he leads us to the clear conclusion that, when God inspired the Scriptures He supernaturally, and as a principal cause, employed the faculties of the inspired writer, as His instruments in the psychological labor which man would have undergone if he had been writing in his own name instead of writing in the name of God. If writing for himself, the man would have had the same labor, but he would not have had the same divine impulse and guidance, the same divine assistance, the same divine illumination in the doing of his task. The whole result belongs, not partly to God and partly to man, but in its entirety to God and in its entirety to man. The effect, as a whole, proceeds from both God and man; from God as the chief cause, from man as the free and living instrumental cause. '*Effectus totus attribuitur instrumento, et principali agenti etiam totus . . . sed totus ab utroque secundum alium modum.*'

"On the principles of sound psychology not only does that mechanical speaking-tube theory, introduced by the Reform

Churches, appear in all its grotesqueness and its inconsistency with the plainest facts, but also does the theory of some Catholic theologians who distinguish between 'verba' and 'res et sententias' show itself to be most unnatural. Inspiration covers everything the inspired writer writes—thoughts, opinions, judgments, surmises, the collection and arrangement of materials, method of treatment, style and language. An inspired book is a living whole; and the whole is inspired."

Pesch's work merits still more approbation.

It has been said by eminent scholars that the Catholic doctrine on inspiration is summed up in the one sentence, authoritatively defined by the Church: "God is the author of the Holy Scriptures." Certain it is that all that is determined by the Church on this theme is drawn from that sure principle. The Church has made a few applications of the principle, but has left a very large field open. In entering this field every writer must recognize that however much he may differ from advocates of views differing from his own, he is bound to refrain from branding with any note of infamy opinions which the Church has not yet condemned. In all ages of the Church good men have been material heretics: and on the other hand the *odium theologicum* of those who had a "zeal for God, but not according to knowledge" (Rom. X. 2) has injured the very cause which they wished to defend. It is only by toleration and patient examination of the views of all that we can advance our knowledge of these deep problems. No right-minded, candid seeker after truth will object to arguments against his opinions, but personalities wound the opponent, without promoting their author's side. If passion could be set aside, it would be greatly beneficial to scriptural science if, of the sincere scholars of the Church, there were a conference regarding the different views on Inspiration, that all the arguments pro and con might be weighed dispassionately, and the best adopted.

Of course that which we here state only applies to candid, sincere seekers after truth. There are in the Church certain sycophants who angle for popularity by copying the German

and English and French rationalists. They have no principles, but are like sponges filled with dirty water. These merit only contempt.

Prof. Dods in his lecture on Inspiration declares as follows:

"It is then, only from the Bible itself we can learn what an inspired book is. We may find many unexpected peculiarities in the Bible, but these will not dismay us, if we have not gone to it with a preconceived theory of what it ought to be and of what inspiration *must* accomplish. The Bible must not be forced into conformity with our Procrustean theory of inspiration; but we must allow our theory to be formed by the Bible. If we should find on examination that much of what is human enters into the Bible, we must expand our theory to include this. If we should find discrepancies or inaccuracies, these must help us to our true theory.

"In Professor Bowne's small but excellent book on the 'Christian Revelation,' he very truly says: 'The presence of inspiration is discernible in the product, but the meaning and measure of inspiration cannot be decided by abstract reflection, but only by the outcome. What inspiration is, must be learned from what it does. We must not determine the character of the books from the inspiration, but must rather determine the nature of the inspiration from the books' (pp. 44-45).

"The problem in regard to inspiration is, to adjust truly the Divine and the human factors. The various theories which have been framed and held differ from one another regarding the proportion which the human element in the process and in the result bears to the Divine."

No other view is consistent with the protestant principle of the rejection of the obedience of faith to the Church's teaching. It is true that the Bible is the only inspired book in the world; it is true that it is impossible *a priori* to establish a perfect system which will embrace every proposition; but it is not true that we must come to the Bible with no preconception of what it is. The Church of God, to whom Christ promised infallibility and indefectibility in the exercise of her mission teaches us with authority that the

Bible is a book of God's authorship, that it is the word of God, and every theory based upon an examination of the Bible itself must be *forced into conformity with this infallible definition*.

We see therefore that the field in which Catholic theologians may differ is in applying the principles which the Church has defined to the specific statements of the Bible; and here it must be granted that the divergency of opinion is very great.

Many of the difficulties which science and the investigations of criticism have brought up were unknown to the Fathers, and we find in them an unquestioning acceptance of the Scriptures as the word of God. Clement of Rome declares: "Ye have searched the Scriptures, which are true, which were given through the Holy Ghost; and Ye know that nothing unrighteous or counterfeit is written in them" (I. Cor. 45).

Justin the Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho, Chap. VII. clearly asserts the inspiration of the Holy Books:

"There existed, long before this time, certain men more ancient than all those who are esteemed philosophers, both righteous and beloved by God, who spoke by the Divine Spirit, and foretold events which would take place, and which are now taking place. They are called prophets. These alone both saw and announced the truth to men, neither reverencing nor fearing any man, not influenced by a desire for glory, but speaking those things alone which they saw and which they heard, being filled with the Holy Spirit. Their writings are still extant, and he who has read them is very much helped in his knowledge of the beginning and end of things, and of those matters which the philosopher ought to know, provided he has believed them. For they did not use demonstration in their treatises, seeing that they were witnesses to the truth above all demonstration, and worthy of belief; and those events which have happened, and those which are happening, compel you to assent to the utterances made by them, although, indeed, they were entitled to credit on account of the miracles which they performed, since they both glorified the Creator, the God and Father of all things,

and proclaimed His Son, the Christ [sent] by Him: which, indeed, the false prophets, who are filled with the lying unclean spirit, neither have done nor do, but venture to work certain wonderful deeds for the purpose of astonishing men, and glorify the spirits and demons of error."

Again in the same treatise he answers Trypho:

"If you spoke these words, Trypho, and then kept silence in simplicity and with no ill intent, neither repeating what goes before nor adding what comes after, you must be forgiven; but if [you have done so] because you imagined that you could throw doubt on the passage, in order that I might say the Scriptures contradicted each other, you have erred. But I shall not venture to suppose or to say such a thing; and if a Scripture which appears to be of such a kind be brought forward, and if there be a pretext [for saying] that it is contrary [to some other], since I am entirely convinced that no Scripture contradicts another, I shall admit rather that I do not understand what is recorded, and shall strive to persuade those who imagine that the Scriptures are contradictory, to be rather of the same opinion as myself."

Athenagoras applying to every inspired agent the name of prophet describes their inspiration thus:

"But we have for witnesses of the things we apprehend and believe, prophets, men who have pronounced concerning God and the things of God, guided by the Spirit of God. And you too will admit, excelling all others as you do in intelligence and in piety towards the true God that it would be irrational for us to cease to believe in the Spirit from God, who moved the mouths of the prophets like musical instruments, and to give heed to mere human opinions." (A Plea for Christians).

Irenæus makes the Holy Ghost the Author of the Scriptures. In II. Against Heresies, XXVIII. 2, he thus declares:

"If, however, we cannot discover explanations of all those things in Scripture which are made the subject of investigation, yet let us not on that account seek after any other God besides Him who really exists. For this is the very greatest impiety. We should leave things of that nature

to God who created us, being most properly assured that the Scriptures are indeed perfect, since they were spoken by the Word of God and His Spirit; but we, inasmuch as we are inferior to, and later in existence than the Word of God and His Spirit, are on that very account destitute of the knowledge of His mysteries. And there is no cause for wonder if this is the case with us as respects things spiritual and heavenly, and such as require to be made known to us by revelation, since many even of those things which lie at our very feet (I mean such as belong to this world, which we handle and see, and are in close contact with) transcend our knowledge; so that even these we must leave to God.

Again *ibid.* Bk. IV. 12. 3. Irenaeus enumerates the Catholic doctrine: "as soon as he of apostolic rank appears in a Scripture which appears to be of apostolic rank."

But since the writings (*litera*) of Moses are the words of Christ, He does Himself declare to the Jews, as John has recorded in the Gospel: "If ye had believed Moses, ye would have believed Me: for he wrote of Me." But if ye believe not his writings, neither will ye believe My words." He thus indicates in the clearest manner that the writings of Moses are His words. If, then, [this be the case with regard] to Moses, so also, beyond a doubt, the words of the other prophets are His [words], as I have pointed out. And again, the Lord Himself exhibits Abraham as having said to the rich man, with reference to all those who were still alive: "If they do not obey Moses and the prophets, neither, if any one were to rise from the dead and go to them, will they believe him."

And again *ibid.* XI. 1. "And now do the Scriptures testify of Him, unless all things had ever been revealed and shown to believers by one and the same God through the Word; He at one time conferring with His creature, and at another propounding His law; at one time, again reproving, at another exhorting, and then setting free His servant, and adopting him as a son (*in filium*), and, at the proper time, bestowing an incorruptible inheritance, for the purpose of bringing man to perfection." For He formed him for growth

On that degree. John V. 46, 47. Luke XVII. 36.

and increase, as the Scripture says: 'Increase and multiply.' * * * Origen is very explicit: "Since, in our investigation of matters of such importance, not satisfied with the common opinions, and with the clear evidence of visible things, we take in addition, for the proof of our statements, testimonies from what are believed by us to be divine writings, viz. from that which is called the Old Testament, and that which is styled the New, and endeavor by reason to confirm our faith; and as we have not yet spoken of the Scriptures as divine, come and let us, as if by way of an epitome, treat of a few points respecting them, laying down those reasons which lead us to regard them as divine writings." (De Principiis, Bk. IV.) The same doctrine is consistently propounded by St. Theophilus of Antioch, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Marius Victorinus, Hilary of Poitiers, and others. Clement of Alexandria believes in a full inspiration of the Holy Scriptures: "I could adduce ten thousand Scriptures of which not one title shall pass away without being fulfilled, for the mouth of the Lord, or the Holy Spirit, hath spoken these things." (Exhortation to the Heathen, IX.) Again in the Stromata, VIII. 6, Clement declares: "Accordingly, if those fall from this eminence who follow not God, which he leads, and he leads us, in the inspired Scriptures. All his writings are full of reverence to the Holy Scriptures as the infallible word of God." Space is not afforded for the numerous passages from the works of St. Basil in which he declares the Scriptures to be divine. Let one short passage serve as an illustration of his views. In his letter (XII.) to the noble, he declares: "Never neglect reading, especially of the New Testament, because very frequently mischief comes of reading the Old; not because what is written is harmful; but because the minds of the injured are weak. All bread is nutritious, but it may be injurious to the sick. Just so all Scripture is God inspired

* Cf. 2 Tim. III. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

and profitable,* and there is nothing in it unclean: only to him who thinks it is unclean, to him it is unclean."

St. Athanasius to Marcellinus (Migne 27. 11) speaks thus of Holy Scripture: "All Scripture, O Son, both of the Old and of the New Testament is divinely inspired and useful for teaching, as it is written."

In his Thirty-ninth Letter St. Athanasius appeals to the constant tradition regarding the divinely inspired Scripture: "In proceeding to make mention of these things, I shall adopt, to commend my undertaking, the pattern of Luke the Evangelist, saying on my own account: 'Forasmuch as some have taken in hand,' † to reduce into order for themselves the books termed apocryphal, and to mix them up with the divinely inspired Scripture, concerning which we have been fully persuaded, as they who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word, delivered to the fathers; it seemed good to me also, having been urged thereto by true brethren, and having learned from the beginning, to set before you the books included in the Canon, and handed down, and accredited as Divine."

One passage will illustrate the belief of Gregory of Nyssa: "The Scripture, 'given by inspiration of God,' as the Apostle calls it, is the Scripture of the Holy Spirit, and its intention is the profit of men. For 'every scripture,' he says, 'is given by inspiration of God and is profitable;' and the profit is varied and multiform, as the Apostle says—'for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.' " ‡ (Against Eunomius Bk. VII. 1.)

It is superfluous to review the enormous bulk of writings of the Latin Fathers. No one will deny that they unanimously taught the doctrine on inspiration which the Councils of the Church has now defined. St. Ambrose (On the Holy Spirit, Bk. III. XVI. 112) clearly enunciates the doctrine: "How, then, does He not possess all that pertains to God, Who is named by priests in baptism with the Father and the Son, and is invoked in the oblations, is proclaimed by the Seraphim in heaven with the Father and the Son, dwells

* Cf. 2 Tim. III. 16. † 4a i.e. Ezra and Nehemiah. ‡ 2 Tim. III. 15.

in the Saints with the Father and the Son, is poured upon the just, is given as the source of inspiration to the prophets? And for this reason in the divine Scripture all is called *θεόπνευστος*, because God inspires what the Spirit has spoken."

St. Jerome fills his works with declarations like these: "I am not, I repeat, so ignorant as to suppose that any of the Lord's words is either in need of correction, or is not divinely inspired." (To Marcella Letter XXVII.); "the Scriptures were written and promulgated by the Holy Ghost." (On Ephesians I. 10); "all the Scriptures were written by the one Holy Spirit, and therefore are called one book." (On Isaiah XXIX. 9.)

We shall close these few representative quotations with these declarations of St. Augustine: "For it seems to me that most disastrous consequences must follow upon our believing that anything false is found in the sacred books: that is to say, that the men by whom the Scripture has been given to us, and committed to writing, did put down in these books anything false. It is one question whether it may be at any time the duty of a good man to deceive; but it is another question whether it can have been the duty of a writer of Holy Scripture to deceive: nay, it is not another question—it is no question at all. For if you once admit into such a high sanctuary of authority one false statement as made in the way of duty,* there will not be left a single sentence of those books which, if appearing to any one difficult in practice or hard to believe, may not by the same fatal rule be explained away, as a statement in which, intentionally, and under a sense of duty, the author declared what was not true." (Letter XXVIII. 3): "For I confess to your Charity that I have learned to yield this respect and honour only to the canonical books of Scripture: of these alone do I most firmly believe that the authors were completely free from error. And if in these writings I am perplexed by anything which appears to me opposed to truth, I do not hesitate to suppose that either the ms. is faulty, or the translator has not caught the meaning of what was said, or I

* *Officiosum mendacium.*

myself have failed to understand it. As to all other writings, in reading them, however great the superiority of the authors to myself in sanctity and learning, I do not accept their teaching as true on the mere ground of the opinion being held by them, but only because they have succeeded in convincing my judgment of its truth; either by means of these canonical writings themselves, or by arguments addressed to my reason. With the Fathers there was not much thought of the analysis of the concepts of inspiration; they were content to affirm the canonical books to be the word of God, without analysing the question which in our day is the first question in divine science.

In the formula of faith called "The Ancient Statutes of the Church" which is falsely attributed to the Fourth Council of Carthage (Mansi) it is demanded of the bishop to make profession of faith that God is the *author of both the Old and the New Testaments*. This formula has been accepted as the Catholic doctrine. The Council of Trent reaffirmed it, and the Vatican Council explained and promulgated it.

The older theologians generally ascribe to the divine element in Scripture an excessive part. The Faculty of Louvain and Douai declared: "It is an intolerable and great blasphemy, if any shall affirm that any of those words can be found in Scripture. All the words of Scripture are so many sacraments (or mysteries). Every phrase, syllable, letter, and point is full of a divine sense, as Christ says in St. Matthew: 'a jot or a tittle shall not pass from the law'."

Melchior Canus tempers the doctrine somewhat. "In his second book, *De Locis Theol.* after stating and refuting the opinions of those who thought that the sacred writers in the canonical books did not always speak by the Divine Spirit," he establishes the following proposition: that "every particle of the canonical books was written by the assistance of the Holy Spirit." He says: "I admit that the sacred writers had no need of a proper and express revelation in writing every particle of the Scripture: but that every part of the Scripture was written by a peculiar instinct and impulse of the Holy Ghost, fully and rightly

contending. After saying that some things were known to them by supernatural revelation, and others by natural knowledge, he adds, that they did not heed a supernatural light and express revelation to write these little truths, but they needed the presence and peculiar help of the Holy Ghost, that these things, though they were human truths and known by natural reason, should nevertheless be written divinely and without any error. (In Old Doct. Theol. III 16).

Dominicus Banez is deeper and more explicit. "For the establishment of truth we must know that when it is said that a Scripture is inspired of God, it can be understood in three ways. The first manner (of inspiration) has place when the things to be written were unknown to the writer, and were made known by the inspiration of God; not in a common way. The second way is when the thing which is written was indeed known to the writer, but the impulse to write it came from a special ongoing and inspiration of God; and therefore the writer is protected by a special assistance of the Holy Ghost lest by malice or forgetfulness he should be deceived in anything. In the third way Scripture is said to be inspired, for the reason that God not only revealed hidden things to the writer, or moved him to write things known to him, and upheld him lest he should err, but also suggested and, as it were, dictated the very words which he should write. Therefore let this be the first conclusion. The Holy Scripture of which we speak proceeds from divine revelation sometimes in the first manner and sometimes in the second. This should be the firm belief of all Catholics. And it is proved because (the Scripture) in some parts contains many things which transcend every created mind such as the Mystery of the Trinity and the Incarnation and many other things; in other parts it contains things which fall within the compass of natural reason and experience. But in all these things even the most diligent and attentive writer may at times be deceived or may forget. Therefore, in all these things partly by revelation, partly by impelling and assisting, the Holy Ghost was with the writer lest he should deviate from the truth."

The second conclusion: The Holy Ghost inspired not only the matter of the Scriptures but also suggested and dictated every word by which they should be written. "For if it were left to the free will of the sacred writer to choose the words by which he should express or write the thoughts, he might err in expressing what was revealed to him; and thus in the Scriptures there might be found falsehood."

But the great Dominican felt obliged to temper this doctrine in his third conclusion: "If anyone should affirm that the composition of the words is often left to the knowledge and diligence of the sacred writer in such a manner however, that such a one affirms the necessary assistance of the Holy Ghost lest the writer err in the words or in their composition, he says nothing so contrary to faith, that the assertion should be gravely censured; although to me the opinion seems not true or altogether safe on account of the argument adduced to prove the preceding conclusion. This conclusion (that verbal inspiration is not of faith) is proven by the fact that when the sacred writer writes the things which he sees, in order that the Scripture be called inspired it is enough that the Holy Ghost move his mind to write these things, and that he be guided by the Holy Ghost lest he forget what he is commanded to write. Therefore the same cooperation of the Holy Ghost will suffice for the composition of words which the writer of himself may effect.

"Nevertheless it is safer and freer from blame to say that as the Holy Ghost moves the mind of the writer to write, so also he inspires the words and composition. And this is proven, for, unless we say thus, we shall be scarcely able to assign a difference between the Holy Scriptures and the definitions of Councils. For in both cases the Holy Ghost assists lest there should be error. And if in both cases the words and their composition be left to human industry, it follows that there is no difference, for also the definitions of Councils by the assistance of the Holy Ghost contain infallible truth," (Schol. Comment, in D. Thom. Q. I.)

The Thomistic theologians quite generally defended verbal inspiration. Most recently Zaneccchia (*Div. Inspir.*

ad Mentem S. Thomae, Romae, 1899, 1903, p. 175) declares: "The action of the Holy Ghost in inspiration is not restricted to the conception of the ideas and to the communicating of them to the inspired writer; but extends itself to the very writing, that is to the words, the expressions, the style; in a word, to all that which is written by the inspired writers, and to the manner in which they expressed these things in writing."

Against this rigid system of inspiration a reaction was inaugurated by Lessius and Hamel. In 1586, Lessius and Hamel, in their lectures at Louvain, taught the following propositions:—

1. "Ut aliquid sit Scriptura Sacra, non est necessarium singula ejus verba inspirata esse a Spiritu Sancto." "That a book be Holy Scripture, it is not necessary that every word of it be inspired by the Holy Ghost."

2. "Non est necessarium ut singulæ veritates et sententiæ sint immediate a Spiritu Sancto ipsi Scriptori inspiratæ." "It is not necessary that every truth or sentence be immediately inspired into the writer by the Holy Ghost."

3. "Liber aliquis (qualis forte est secundus Machabæorum) humana industria sine assistentia Spiritus Sancti scriptus, (si Spiritus Sanctus postea testetur nihil ibi esse falsum, efficitur Scriptura Sacra."* "A book (such as perhaps the 2nd of Maccabees), written by human industry, without the assistance of the Holy Ghost—if the Holy Spirit afterwards testify that nothing false is contained in it—becomes Holy Scripture."

These propositions were at once assailed. The archbishops of Cambrai and Mechlin sent them to the Faculties of Douai and Louvain.† They were condemned by both. The third was especially censured. Estius, who drew up the censure, in his "Commentary on the Epistles" gives his own opinion as follows: "From this passage it is rightly and truly established, that all the sacred and canonical Scripture is written by the dictation of the Holy Ghost; so that not only the sense, but every word, and the order of the words,

* See *Theol. Wirceburg.* tom. 1. p. 23. † Ibid.

and the whole arrangement is from God, as if He were speaking or writing in person. For this is the meaning of the Scripture being divinely inspired. * Not long after the Lessius and Hamer appealed to the Sorbonne. The Faculty of Paris did not approve either of the Jesuit propositions, nor of the censures of Louvain and Douai. The Faculties of Mayence, Treves, Ingoldstadt, and Rome disapproved the censures; but Sixtus V. imposed silence until the Holy See should pronounce on the subject. has never been decided. The censures are given by D'Argentre, in his *Collectio Juridicorum Hæcæsis Baroniæ*, and the Jesuit propositions are defended by P. Simon, in his *Histoire Critique et Reflexe du Nouveau Testament*. *

Lessius defended himself in a special treatise entitled, "*Responsio ad Censuram Assertionum de Scriptura*." In this he states: "In these propositions there can be no difficulty if they be understood as they have otherwise been explained by us. As regards the two first we do not deny that the sacred writers wrote by a peculiar inspiration, and direction, and assistance of the Holy Ghost. But this we say that for every sentence and every word it was not necessary that they should receive a new and positive inspiration from the Holy Spirit; that is a new illumination by which in a new manner they should know the truths which they wrote, and should see the words which the Holy Ghost wished them to use; but that it was sufficient that the Holy Ghost should in a special way induce them and move them to write the things which they had heard or seen, or in any other way known. And that he should assist them in regard to the expressions and the words, and where need was, direct them. This opinion seems to me the more probable one. First, because the Evangelists and other sacred writers had need to have needed a new revelation to write the things they saw or heard from faithful witnesses; as Paul learned in a brief time, not from men but from Jesus Christ, the Gospel. And John wrote that which he saw, as is evident I. John 1; and in the same way Matthew wrote. But Mark wrote what he

* *Estii Comment. in Epistolam Timoth. cap. III. v. 16.* *

heard from Peter, James, and Luke what he received from those who had seen, as he testifies in the beginning of his Gospel. In the same way I should believe that, by the sacred historians were written many things which they had seen or heard without a new revelation. Secondly, it is proved from reason. For the Holy Ghost employs fitting instruments, as he finds them, and as he is not wanting in necessary things, neither is he redundant in sufficient things. And men who know a thing with certainty and have the art of expressing thought are capable of writing it. Therefore, if the Holy Ghost wishes to use them as instruments, and if it is not necessary that he reveal to them these things anew, but is enough that he select them for his own uses and move them by a special impulse to write what they already know, and that he assist them in a special way, in all words and sentences, that they commit not the least error.

For the better explaining of this we must know that a thing may be written through inspiration of the Holy Ghost in two ways. First, that the Holy Ghost by a new supernatural inspiration make manifest all the things to be written, and all the words, and thus the Prophets wrote their prophecies, as is evident in Jeremiah XXXVI. who dictated his prophecies with such facility that he seemed to read them. Secondly, that the Holy Ghost by a special impulse should excite and move the one whom he appoints to write the things which he already has seen or heard, in any other way known, and that the Holy Ghost assist him in every word and sentence. And I hold it to be probable that many Evangelists and sacred historians wrote thus, so that they needed not a new and positive inspiration and illumination about every thing. And I am the more inclined to this opinion for the reason that by a contrary principle to wit, that they believe every word to be dictated by the Holy Spirit by a new inspiration, many heretics of our day try to prove that the books of Maccabees are not canonical Scripture, and so on. If it were thus St. Luke would not say that he wrote the things which he received from the Apostles who had seen them, but he would say (that he wrote) the things which he received from the Holy Ghost who specially dic-

tated them. . . . Now it is enough for the sacred historians that God by a special impulse move them to write the things which they already know, and infallibly assist them in all things. By this is not removed the labor of calling to mind things heard, seen, and read, and of coordinating them, and, as one judges most fitting, of expressing them in proper words. Wherefore it comes to pass that the more eloquent speak more eloquently, and the less eloquent less ornately."

It is evident here that the difficulty lies in the ambiguous use of the term inspiration. Lessius did not distinguish between revelation and inspiration. In his explanation he makes his meaning clear, that he extends inspiration to all the Scriptures, and in a proper degree to the words themselves; while he restricts revelation to those things which the writers did not know by natural means. If this distinction be inserted we believe that no one has written on the theme more clearly or correctly.

In treating the third proposition Lessius is no less fortunate: "The third opinion, leaving out the clause in parentheses, seems to me wholly certain, unless there be question about terms. Let us suppose that by a pious man well furnished with the knowledge, a pious history be written by the impulse of the Holy Ghost, and that the writer without the special assistance of inspiration write the truth, and commit no error. If the Holy Ghost, by some prophet or otherwise, attest that what is there written be true and saving, I see no reason why that book should not have the authority of Holy Scripture, since it has the same motive of credibility that any other prophecy has, namely, divine authority. And I say this not that I assert that such was the method of inspiration of any part of Holy Scripture; nay, more, I believe that in fact nothing of this kind is found in Holy Scripture, but I speak only of possibility. Hence the proposition is conditional. If God willed he could have acted in this manner in the Scriptures, for it does not imply a contradiction, and such Scripture would be equal to the other parts in divine authority."

We see here that Lessius has retracted somewhat. By cutting out the parenthetical clause he removes the question

to the region of speculations on the possible, and no man can object to his reasoning.

The Faculties of Louvain and Douai had charged Lessius with the error of the Anomœi, an obscure sect described by S. Epiphanius. Their capital error was to divide the Scriptures into the divine and human parts, and to deny authority to the things which the writers wrote as men. Lessius in his defense shows how absurd it was to accuse him of their error, and adds: "We say, therefore, that all parts of the Scripture are of infallible truth, and are of the Holy Ghost who inspires by a new *revelation*, or moves by a special impulse, and assists in every word and sentence; and as we have elsewhere abundantly demonstrated, we hold that there is not in them the least error, for it would redound upon the Holy Ghost, and the authority of the whole Scripture would totter; although it is not necessary that the Holy Ghost inspire everything, in a special manner illumining the writer." (In Schneeman Controv. de div. grat. Friburgi, 1881, 467 seqq.)

We see here the same confusion between inspiration and revelation.

The Faculty of Louvain answered Lessius in a treatise called "Antapologia," and Lessius again delivered a defence in which he makes the issues still clearer. Among other things he says that even when God did not give to the sacred writers new revelations, "he directed them in everything, lest they should write other things, or in a manner different from his good-pleasure; but this took place without a new revelation, or new mode of understanding. Thus it is plain in what sense the writer of II. Maccab. could declare his tongue to be the pen of a ready scribe, because he was moved and directed by the Holy Ghost; and also (it is plain) in what sense he could not so declare, for the Holy Ghost did not beforehand form all the words in his mind, as one does who in the proper sense dictates. . . . For the concept of Holy Scripture does not essentially include that all the material words be dictated by the Holy Ghost, but this is an accessory and ornament (of inspiration). Otherwise if the Hebrew and Greek exemplars were lost the Church

would be without the Holy Scriptures. Nay, more, if the Latin Church would not have the Scriptures, for the Latin edition would not be Scripture itself. I to which if we look closely we shall see that the essence of Holy Scripture consists in this that the proposition be the word of God in whatever tongue expressed, named by. Concerning the third proposition, from as one that conjectured in which it is said that perhaps the book of Maccabees was written by human industry, I said not as my opinion, but as the opinion of those whom I have before cited but not approved, who think the author to have been a pagan, and the book to have acquired authority from the Apostles and from the Church. Which opinion Sixtus of Sienna expresses with sufficient clearness (Bib. Sacra II. 8. haec. 1. resp. ad 7) where he says: "It matters not what is the opinion of the Jews concerning these books, since the Catholic Church receives them into her canon; and it derogates nothing from their authority if they be written by a pagan, since the authority of a book depends not on the author but on the authority of the Church; and that which she receives must be true and infallible, whoever he said to be the author, whom I should not dare pronounce to be either pagan writer or sacred writer. This is his opinion. We did not approve this opinion, but we said the author (of Maccabees) was a faithful man; as it is fitting that a sacred writer should be eyed and regarded that third opinion. I believe and have always believed that there exists no such book which was written without the assistance, impulse and direction of the Holy Ghost." (Ibid. 287 sqq.)

Estius, one of the chief opponents of Lessius, thus formulates the opinion of the faculty of Louvain: "Rightly and truly it is established that all holy (and canonical) Scripture is written by the dictation of the Holy Ghost, in a manner so that not only the matter, but also every word, and the order of the words and the whole structure is of God, as though himself speaking and writing." (Estius on II Tim. III. 16.)

In the heat of the controversy that was waged about divine grace, Lessius was misunderstood and misrepresented.

His statements were torn from their context, and often garbled into a distorted meaning. It is true he used an ambiguous term in his first two propositions; but his explanation does honor to his knowledge and his faith. His third proposition is not well enunciated. His own expunging of the parenthesis is a retractation; but dealing with a possibility he utters nothing contrary to faith. As Bishop Gasser rightly argued in the Vatican Council, that Council's condemnation of the theory of a subsequent inspiration does not apply to Lessius. He spoke of a possibility; the Council spoke of the existing books. Moreover, Lessius admits into his hypothetical book the element of present inspiration; because the Holy Ghost must approve the book "through a prophet, or in some other manner." Therefore Lessius makes the authority of the book the effect of the Holy Ghost. For instance let us suppose, as every one is free to do, that Jason who wrote the original of II. Maccab. was not inspired. Let us suppose that the writer who abridged these books into the one book of II. Maccab. wrote no word of his own, but only selected from the five books. Still the element of inspiration would be there, not disclosing new truths; but moving the writer to make the abridgment, and positively aiding him to arrange these things into an infallible book. Of course we are speaking of a mere hypothesis; for it seems evident that the writer of Maccabees did not servilely copy passages from Jason; but compendiously wrote for a religious end certain things, in an epoch which had been more extensively described by the historian Jason.

Of Lessius' three propositions Bellarmine speaks thus: "The three propositions on Scripture, enunciated without explanation, sound bad, and are liable to calumny. But Father Lessius has rightly explained the two first. For the third he has recently written an apology, and although he has not satisfied me fully, yet the opinion as modified and tempered by him seems tolerable." (Apud Schneeman, *op. cit.*)

The system of inspiration taught by Bellarmine in the main agrees with the two first propositions of Lessius. Thus

he declares: "The first is that the Scripture is the word of God immediately revealed, and written as it were by the dictation of God. . . . But this is not to be understood as though the sacred writers always had new revelations, and wrote what they beforehand were ignorant of; for it is certain that the Evangelists Matthew and John wrote what they saw; but Mark and Luke, what they heard, as Luke declares in the beginning of his Gospel. The sacred writers are said therefore to have an immediate revelation, and to have written the words of God himself, either because certain new things, before unknown, were revealed to them . . . or because God immediately inspired and moved the writers to write the things which they had seen and heard, and directed them lest they should err in any matter." (De Conc. 1. 2. 12.)

Suarez defines Holy Scripture to be "a writing by the impulse of the Holy Ghost, who dictated not only the sense but also the words." After describing the necessity of verbal inspiration, he tempers the doctrine as follows: "In two ways the words of Holy Scripture may be understood to be of the Holy Ghost, either by a special antecedent motion or only by an assistance, and as it were, safeguarding. The first way is when the Holy Ghost either imprints the mental word by infused ideas, or specially moves and calls up pre-existing ideas, and this mode is the most proper to (the Holy Ghost), and the most perfect, and most probably was followed when the mysteries to be written were supernatural, and surpassed human reason.

But it seems not necessary, although recent learned men so teach, that always the words be dictated in this special way. For when a sacred writer writes something which is of natural reason and within the compass of the senses, it seems sufficient that the Holy Spirit specially assist him and save him from all error and untruth and from all words which are not profitable or becoming to Holy Scripture, removing everything which might suggest such (unfitting) words, and for the rest permitting the writer to use his memory, and his ideas, and diligence in writing as Luke acknowledges in the beginning of his Gospel. It is enough there-

fore that either in one way or in the other according to the exigency of the matter, the words be of the Holy Ghost."

To the question: Whether there be anything in the Holy Scriptures which was not written by the action of the Holy Ghost, and consequently is not Holy Scripture, Suarez replies: "The Holy Writer writes nothing purely of himself, but everything and each thing is by the direction of the Holy Ghost." (De Fide V. 3.)

A classic writer on this theme is Marchini (†1773). In his work *De Divinitate et Canonicitate Sacrorum Bibliorum*, Art. V., he defines the concept of inspiration: "The first question which demands solution is whether the Holy Ghost placed every word in the sacred writer's mind and mouth. This truth is evident to those who study the question that not to leave to the writer's natural faculties the selection of the words and the diction is needless and superfluous for our defence of the truth, dignity, and infallibility of Holy Scripture. It is enough for this defence that as regards the things written, God infuse them into the writer's mind, or call them up in his mind, and that he assist him that he employ apt words, and leave aside unfitting ones. Why therefore should the Holy Ghost inspire every word, who is neither wanting in the necessary, nor redundant in the superfluous?" Marchini confirms this from the sacred writers' diversity of style, from the fact that the same thing is described in different words by different writers, from the literary imperfections of Scripture, and from the authority of the versions. He promulgates more accurately Lessius' principle that revelation does not extend to all parts of Scripture. He defines inspiration to be "a special impulse of the Holy Ghost to write, and a directing and assistance governing the mind and soul of the writer which permits him not to err, and causes him to write what God wills."

Marchini strongly condemns "the error of those who violate the Scriptures by teaching that in certain minor things as they say, not necessary to salvation, the Prophets and Apostles wrote merely as men without that special action of God, without which a book can not be divine." He alleges as proof II. Tim. III. 16; II. Peter. I. 21, and the

authority of the Fathers. He declares that the whole authority of the Scriptures would totter if in minor things, errors be admitted, since certain limits between great and small can not be admitted." Marchini differentiates the Holy Scriptures from other infallible documents by the fact that a positive divine action pervades the whole Scripture. And, he says, "this divine afflatus or inspiration can be present, even though God does not by a special action furnish the words nor the sentences. . . . That is, if the Holy Ghost assists the writer whom he beforehand moved to write; if he aptly suggests that which he wishes written, if perchance the writer's memory fail him; if he enlightens the mind with that light which expels all pernicious ignorance, and removes rashness; if he strengthens with such power that things are written faithfully, plainly, and consistently; if he brings to the mind things hidden, sublime and unknown; if he leaves no part of Scripture deprived of his protection, surely the books will be written by God's inspiration, although the manner of speech, and the sentences often proceed from man's mind, memory, study, thought, and diligence."

Among the great theologians of the XIX. Century, Cardinal Franzelin holds an eminent place. His system of inspiration has been made the subject of a special attack by that reaction which in our day has set in towards a more liberal view of inspiration. In his work "*Tractatus de Divina Traditione et Scriptura*" (Ed. 3, Romae, 1882) he treats the question of inspiration at length. Among other things he declares that the books of Scripture are of divine authority "for the reason that they are the books of God, and God is their author by his supernatural action on the human *co-writers*, which action by ecclesiastical usage drawn from the Scriptures themselves is called inspiration."

"A book is divine in the strict sense for the reason that it is written by God through the instrumentality of a man whom God so moves to write, and in whom God so operates in writing, that God himself in the strict sense should be considered the principal Author. This supernatural and extraordinary action of God is called inspiration" (Thesis II.)

From intrinsic and extrinsic evidence Franzelin places the essence of inspiration in a *charisma gratis datum* enlightening so that the minds of inspired men understand in order to write the truths which by Scripture God wishes to give to his Church, and the wills are moved to consign these only to writing; and thus assisted man under the action of God, the principal cause, infallibly executes the divine counsel. Hence distinguishing between inspiration and assistance, inspiration must be said to embrace the truths, and the formal word; while assistance is extended to the material words." (Thesis III.)

The teaching of Lessius that revelation is not essential to inspired Scripture has now become the universal teaching.

Franzelin distinguishes the formal part of a book which he calls the *veritates* from the material part, that is the words. He demands inspiration as he has described it for the formal element; but for the words he requires only an assistance to guarantee that they aptly express the thoughts: "Regarding the words it is clear that the truths, that is the thoughts of the principal Author, can not be expressed in writing unless terms be chosen fitting to express the sense. If therefore, God by his inspiration of the things and thoughts thus acts on the inspired man to the intent that he write, so that the writing, infallibly in virtue of the divine operation, truly and sincerely contains the thoughts of God, there must accompany the divine inspiration or be included in it such a divine operation that the man writing, not only actually elect, but also infallibly elect terms apt truthfully and sincerely to express the inspired substance and sentences, and that he be thus made infallible in choosing words and other things which pertain to the material part (of the inspired writings). A man inspired in mind and will to write the thoughts of God, but left to himself in the election of the terms would remain fallible in expressing the inspired thoughts; and by this therefore it would not follow infallibly that a book written by such inspiration would be in the full sense inspired Scripture and the word of God."

"From what has been said it is evident what is this divine operation which we declare to accompany inspiration. The

aim of most, at least, of the Holy books is such that the formal object of the book is not affected if the same things and sentences be expressed by different words or different style, provided that words apt and befitting the subject be chosen. . . . 'For we do not believe that the Gospel consists in the words of Scripture but in the sense; not on the surface, but in the marrow; *non in sermonum foliis sed in radice rationis.*' " (S. Jerome on Gal. I. II. 12.)

"Therefore, from the definition of inspiration and from the fact that God is the Author of the Scriptures by means of human co-writers, so that through the very action of God upon inspired men it is infallibly certain that the Scriptures are the books of God as their Author; in most cases, that is where the choosing of certain words instead of other equivalents pertains merely to the material part, there is no reason to affirm that God by an antecedent supernatural action furnished the words and the style of writing, and individually determined them. But there is a reason of affirming God's assistance by which he so aided the writers in choosing apt terms, that in expressing inspired thoughts, they were fully infallible."

Franzelin adduces three classes of arguments to refute the mechanical idea of verbal inspiration. One proof for the thesis under consideration is found in the variety of style prevailing among the different authors. Isaiah is polished and cultured in his diction; Jeremiah, on the contrary, and Amos are less polished and coarser in their style. Isaiah was in high social rank, while Jeremiah was a burgher from Anathoth, and Amos, a cowherd. And differences of style exist among all the inspired writers, due to their different characteristics.

Secondly in the Scriptures, sometimes the same fact is related by different writers in different ways. For instance, the consecration of the chalice is related in four different ways by St. Math., XXVI. 28; St. Mark. XIV. 24; St. Luke, XXII. 20, and St. Paul, I. Cor. XI., 25. These speak of the same words of Christ, as he used them once for all at the Last Supper. If the Holy Ghost had inspired the words, how could we account for these divergencies? Here applies

aptly what St. Augustine said of the inspired writers: "Ut quisque meminerat eos explicasse manifestum est."

The writers of the New Testament rarely or never quote the old Testament literally, but only the sense. In the words of St. Jerome: "Hoc in omnibus pene testimoniis quæ de veteribus libris in novo assumpta sunt Testamento observare debemus, quod memoriæ crediderint Evangelistæ vel Apostoli, et tantum, sensu explicato, saepe ordinem commutaverint, nonnunquam vel detraxerint verba vel addiderint." (Comment. in Epist. ad Galatas.)

Thirdly, the inspired writers themselves disclaim verbal inspiration, asserting that their compositions had been the result of toil, observation and research. The text of II. Maccab. already quoted is an example of this. Also the preface of the Gospel of St. Luke, and various other passages. Now, if the inspiration had been verbal this labor and research would be inconceivable. Again, the writer of the second book of Maccab. XV. 39, in closing his work, speaks thus of his work: "I also with these things, will draw my discourse to an end. And if (I have written) well, and as is befitting history, this I should wish; if only weakly and commonly, *μετρίως*, mediocriter, (not above the average) this is all I could achieve," etc. No such apology for shortcomings were necessary, had the Holy Ghost inspired the words.

Bonfrere, the disciple of Lessius, had taught a doctrine in some points identical with that taught by Lessius. He defended a three-fold relation of the Holy Ghost to the inspired writings; antecedent, concomitant, and consequent. According to Bonfrere, the antecedent relation had actuated the Prophets, who committed to writing the things revealed, without any part in their conception except a passive action, simply as an amanuensis writes down the dictated ideas, always, of course, in their own terms, as we have just seen.

The concomitant relation directed the writer as one would direct another in writing a human document, not permitting him to fall into error. Bonfrere even admitted in this mode a vague general impulse of the Holy Spirit to write such a history. He also admitted a sort of prompting influence, in case the writer's memory failed him, according to that pas-

sage in St. Matthew: "He (the Holy Ghost) will suggest all things to you, whatever I shall have said to you."

Bonfrere asserted this mode of inspiration to have had place in historical books, and in things known by natural means. He therefore applied it to the Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Books of Maccabees, and the other historical books, except the parts of Genesis which treat of the origin of the World.

The consequent relation of the Holy Ghost to Scripture Bonfrere describes thus: "The Holy Ghost has a consequent relation to Holy Scripture if something be written by merely human agency without the help, direction or assistance of the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost afterward give testimony that all that is there written is true. For it is certain that then the whole writing would be the word of God and would have the same infallible authority as other things which were written by the direction or inspiration of the Holy Ghost, as it is the King's word when some secretary or notary by his own authority draws up a royal decree or public document which the King afterwards ratifies and to which he affixes his seal, and it is of equal authority as that which the King himself, conceives, writes or dictates."

Bonfrere believes that in this manner the Holy Ghost accepted the sayings of Aratus and Epimenides, Acts XVII. 28; Titus I. 12. "In the same way the Holy Ghost may make Holy Scripture, by testifying that all is true in it, a whole history or a book treating of morals or of anything else which was written by a uninspired author." (Praeloquia in Script. Sac.)

Bonfrere expressly denied that such had been the origin of any of the books now possessed by the Church, but asserted the non-repugnance of such action, and the possibility that such might have been the origin of some of the inspired works which the Church has lost.

Of Bonfrere's consequent inspiration it must be said, that to assert it of any of the existing books of the Holy Scripture, is condemned in express terms in the definition of the Vatican Council; if it only deals with a possibility, then it is false and absurd; for a *subsequent inspiration* is a contradiction in

terms. As Cornely rightly says: "repugnat in adjecto." For to constitute inspiration, we must have this supernatural psychological action in the mind of the writer, and if this be not verified, no subsequent action can supply it. "Factum infectum fieri non potest." But one might say, God is free to approve a book in such way, and if he were to do so, would not the book be made inspired Scripture? It would be an infallibly true writing, rendered infallible by its subsequent approbation, but not *inspired Scripture*; for the essential element required for inspiration never was there. Wherefore, that such was the origin of any of our Holy Books is denied by the Council of the Vatican; the possibility of such origin is disproved by a consideration of the essential elements of inspiration.

Nevertheless sentences, parts of books, and in fact, any document whatever, passing through the hands of an inspired writer, and used by him in writing a book, under the influence of inspiration, would become inspired Scripture. This is not consequent inspiration, but the employment of an inspired writer's natural faculties in collecting material. It is not probable that any great part of any inspired book was produced in this way; but some data most certainly were thus employed.

Jahn departed farther from the truth than Bonfrere had gone: asserting inspiration to be, in general, only a negative assistance protecting from error, he defended that such was the general origin of our books. Logical in his opinion, and recognizing that *inspiration* imported something positive, he boldly proclaimed that inspiration was a misapplied term; but, consecrated by usage, it was difficult to change.

The concomitant relation of the Holy Ghost to Scripture is also erroneous. This mode is a merely negative influence. The Holy Ghost, as it were, watches the inspired writer to protect him from error, and actually does save him when he would otherwise err. This is not sufficient to make God the Author of the Holy Books..

Inspiration is an *active, positive influence in every part of the Holy Scripture*. No other relation can constitute God the *author* of the Holy Writ. If, indeed, we were to defend

that God only preserved from error, as Calmet asserted, it would follow, that if the writer were exempt from error of himself, unaided by any other cause, God would not be the *author* of the book so written; and, as this would doubtless have happened in many passages and whole chapters, there would thus be parts of which God could not be said to be the author, as He would have had no part except a general supervision in their production. This the definition of the Vatican Council forbids to assert.

Again, there would be no difference, in such case, between the definitions of œcumenical councils and of the Pope's "ex cathedra", and the Holy Scriptures; for in these definitions there is the *negative assistance* of the Holy Ghost. But we know that the dignity and rank of such documents are far below that of the Holy Writ; for these are human documents, infallible in their truth, but they can not be said to have God for their *author*.

In 1885 Dr. Franciscus Schmid, complaining that nowhere could he find a fitting treatise on inspiration, published at Brixen his work entitled: "De Inspirationis Bibliorum vi et ratione," a volume of 422 pages in octavo. It is divided into seven books.

In the first book Dr. Schmid expounds the common Catholic doctrine, that there can be no error in the Scriptures; that all the statements of Scripture rest on the testimony of God and are of divine authority. The reason is that the Scriptures being written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost have God for their principal Author, who employs human writers as instruments. God is not the only Author, because he did not immediately produce the books by miracle; but he wrote them by means of men. That God writing through men, be the true Author, an assistance saving from error is not enough, neither a subsequent approbation, for neither can give to a book the prerogative of a *divine origin*. There is necessary therefore a positive action of God on the man, by which the things which God has in mind and will to write, the (inspired) man also conceives in his mind, and adequately accomplishes. Then the book is to be given to men as divine. The intrinsic and principal

argument is drawn from this that God is the Author of the sacred books. To write a book, or to be a book's author, in the last analysis, means nought else than by writings to speak to the readers; that is, to express in writing that which one thinks in the mind, that they who read may know from his writings the writer's thoughts. But if God did not by his action determine all things that were to be written he himself *would not have spoken* these things; therefore he would not be the Author of the whole book. This applies to the action of God upon the understanding of the inspired writer. But since the inspired writer is an instrument of God, it is required that he write not merely by his own good pleasure, but in the name of God; consequently there is necessary that there should be a divine action on the will of the man and through the will upon his executive faculties."

"There is a great difference between an inspired book and the definitions of the Church; for an inspired book is infallible in all that it affirms; it is a basic fount of revelation; besides divine assistance it requires an extraordinary positive action of God; that it should be written in the name of God, and as God's book delivered to the Church; and even for the words, it requires a special assistance. All these qualities are not found in the definitions of the Church. Nevertheless the labor and vigils of the author do not conflict with the inspiration of a book."

Regarding verbal inspiration Schmid speaks as follows: "It is asked: What is truly required that a book be formally called the word of God? And, to particularize, Is it required that the individual words, just as they are, be of God? We answer, No. But it is not the same to deny that God antecedently determined and inspired in the writer the individual words, as to say that God left to the inspired writer an unrestricted liberty concerning the words and forms of expression. Rather another mode of inspiration which is a mean between the two extremes seems possible. In other words, one can grant that in our books the words and the style are not determined by God for every individual part, and yet maintain that the whole manner of speech which is found in the Scripture, is in a certain manner antecedently determined

by God, and by God's providence, in a manner known to God, brought out in the inspired books by the act of the inspired writers."

"We understand that God brought forth the Scriptures that men in matters of faith and morals might have a book which they might readily and safely believe." "Therefore all things whether they pertain to faith or morals or not, if found in the Scriptures, should have divine authority. Otherwise confusion and doubt will shake the foundations of faith. Therefore, there is no limiting the inspiration of the things affirmed in the Bible, and the words of Scripture must be such that they adequately express God's thought and will." "And God assists the words as far as is necessary for this end."

In 1886, G. J. Crets of the order of the Premonstratensians published at Louvain "De divina Bibliorum inspiratione." After a review of the various opinions, he institutes an analysis of the dogmatic formula, "God is the Author of the Holy Scripture;" for the reason that nothing conduces more to the knowledge of the true concept of inspiration than to ascertain what is required on the part of God, in order that God writing by means of men be called in the common use of the term the Author of the Scriptures. Having made a distinction between the material and formal element of the book, he places as necessary in inspiration that, as regards the formal element of the book, the writer receive a divine *afflatus* by which he may conceive in his mind and be infallibly moved in his will to write all those things, and only those things, which the Holy Ghost has decreed should be written by him. Moreover there is required a certain assistance or some direction from the Holy Ghost that the writer be saved from error and defect in executing the work to which he is divinely moved. By this assistance Crets understands a divine action by which the human writer chooses words apt to express the thoughts of the principal Author. Crets refutes the theory which made inspiration a mere assistance, and he also rejects the theory of subsequent approbation. In the things which the inspired writer acquires by his own faculties Crets teaches that God moves

his will by a special action to write, and to choose the things which God wishes written, and supernaturally enlightens him to know what to write. He believes that it is probable that all the inspired writers were conscious of their inspiration.

Regarding verbal inspiration Crets declares: "We conclude that besides the inspiration in the strict sense of the words and sentences, by which indeterminately and remotely the words and form of expression are furnished, there is not in the main to be admitted a special action of the Holy Ghost in the mode of expression, except the special direction and assistance by which the mind of the writer, in choosing forms of expression characteristic of his temperament and education, is so led that leaving aside incongruous and less exact expressions, he employs words and expressions befitting the inspired thoughts, by which the divine truths may be truthfully and fully expressed in a manner befitting the destination of the books to all the generations of men."

Crets extends inspiration "to all the statements of the Bible, whether they be of faith and morals, or of profane things; whether they be great or small; for if any error be admitted in the Scripture its whole authority is shaken; and also because God is the Author of the whole Scripture with all its parts."

Those who argue against this, base their argument on the purpose of Scripture, which they assert to be not profane but religious.

Crets answers: "The adequate and the ultimate end intended by God in giving us the Holy Scriptures was not that all the truth pertaining to faith and morals should be systematically condensed into certain books, and thus delivered to us; or that in books partly written by purely human agency, portions written by their authors while under divine inspiration should be interspersed; but (the end was) that in things pertaining to faith and morals, for our present life and our eternal life in Heaven, we should be taught by means of books having divine authority for each and every statement; in which books the truths at times are presented in a familiar form; as, for instance, in the form of historical

accounts, narrations and letters; all which not only contain things strictly religious, but also profane matter, which however either from the nature of the thing or from the intention of God, has a proximate or remote relation to the religious truths. Therefore the things essentially religious by the primary intention of God are for their own sake inspired; the other matter is the word of God, written by the divine influx, though accessorially, and for their relation to the things of faith and morals."

Crets affirms that in things of the physical order the sacred writers spoke according to the popular conception of these things, based on the appearances of things. Also in indicating numbers or time the writers at times expressed a certain indetermination as the matter demanded. By this most excellent theory all that is in the Scripture is inspired, but must be properly interpreted according to the principles approved by the Church.

In 1899 at Rome, Zanecchia O. P. published his work on inspiration. This contains little that is new, and its chief feature was an unreasonable attack on Card. Franzelin's theory of inspiration. Zanecchia was ably answered by Fr. J. P. van Kasteren, S. J., of Utrecht in the periodical "Studien." Utrecht 1902. Zanecchia answered in a work entitled "Scriptor sacer sub divina inspiratione juxta sententiam Card. Franzelin", published at Rome in 1903.

The main point urged against Franzelin is that he made the formula "God is the Author of the Scriptures" the fundamental first principle in investigating the nature of inspiration. Zanecchia, Prat and Lagrange argue that the term *author* is ambiguous and can not be made the basis of the clear concept of inspiration. It appears that there is much sophistry in the opposition to Franzelin. The word author has, it is true, several meanings as guarantee, cause, writer, etc.; but as used by the Councils of the Church, the sense in which it is employed in the conciliar formula is made clear by the setting, and it is evident that it means to predicate of God the divine Authorship of the Holy Books.

They say that the term "author" does not contain the term "inspirer" no more than the term "animal" contains

of necessity the concept "man". Therefore, they say that it is not logical to prove God's inspiration from his authorship. But here again there is sophistry. The term "author" *generically considered* does not contain the concept of inspiration; but the concept "author" as used by the councils and as used by Franzelin clearly contains the concept "inspirer." While the concept "inspirer" is ontologically prior to the concept "author", in the order of our cognition the concept of authorship is the clearer; and we understand the essential elements of inspiration from authorship. Therefore, we believe that Billot's remark is à propos: "The new critics seem to themselves to have brought forth a great apparatus of learning (against Franzelin); but in vain, for it would seem that it is their own logic, and not the logic of Card. Franzelin that is defective." (De inspiratione, 25.)

At this point it is well to insert the eminent author Christian Pesch's note on the controversy: "Although it is scarcely necessary, I acknowledge that I have never considered Card. Franzelin's theory definitive; nay more, there are many things in it which I do not approve. The understanding of the dogma of inspiration, not less than that of the other dogmas, continually develops in the Church; nor can any man in this life formulate an immutable theory, beyond which progress will not be possible. God's providence so governs human affairs that there is never closed the way to the knowledge of truth and the love of good. But that Zanecchia never wearies of repeating that the theory of Franzelin is *absurd, obscure, unreasonable, arbitrary*; that (Franzelin's) method is *unreasonable, false, illogical*, and such like, serves indeed to show us the character of the mind of the one who writes such things, but will avail nothing with wise men to overthrow Franzelin's doctrine." (De insp. sac. script. p. 313, note.)

Holden, the English professor at the Sorbonne († 1662), was the first among Catholics to distinguish between the doctrinal parts of Scripture, which, he asserted, were to be believed *fide divina*, and the historical and other parts, which he held to be written without any special influence of the Holy Ghost. Thus in his Analysis of Faith, V.: "The

special divine assistance given to the author of whatever book the Church receives as the word of God, extends only to those things which are *doctrinal*, or have a proximate or necessary bearing on doctrine; but, in these things which are not of the primary intent of the writer, or are relating to other things, we believe him to have received from God only that assistance which is common to other pious writers"; and, II. 3: "Although it is not licit to impeach as false aught contained in the Holy Code, nevertheless, the things which do not relate to religion do not constitute articles of Catholic faith." Holden's doctrine was examined by the Sorbonne and condemned.

Richard Simon in his "Histoire Critique du Nouveau Testament" (Rotterdam, 1689) declares that he dares not condemn the opinion of Holden; and dares not approve it in all its parts. Simon himself delivers his opinion obscurely, but seems content with a negative assistance preserving from error. Thus in his *Réponse aux Sentiments de quelques Théologiens de Hollande*, he asserts: "Therefore when the Gospels are said to be inspired, this is not to be understood in the rigor that all things in these books came immediately from the Holy Ghost; but the sense is that God so controlled their writers that they fell not into error. Men wrote, and the Holy Ghost directed them, and did not deprive them of reason or memory, that he might inspire things which they already knew; but in general he determined them to write certain things rather than other things which they knew equally well."

Chrismann, in his "Rule of Faith" went farther. He declares that while all things in Scripture are true, only the truths of faith and morals are to be believed with divine faith: "Those things which neither antecedently or in the actual writing were revealed are not to be believed with divine faith, . . . as for instance that Pilate was prefect of Judæa when Christ was crucified; or that statement of Paul, II. Tim. IV.: 'Only Luke is with me,' and many other things which merit not divine faith but only Catholic faith. In these things that inspiration suffices by which the Holy Ghost assisted the writers that they might not err."

Some other obscure theologians both before and after Christmann held these opinions. It was therefore to eradicate these errors that the Vatican Council promulgated its decree: "Qui quidem veteris et novi Testamenti libri integri cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ejusdem Concilii decreto recensentur, et in veteri vulgata latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis suscipiendi sunt. Eos vero Ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet, non ideo quod sola humana industria concinnati, sua deinde auctoritate sint approbati; nec ideo dumtaxat, quod revelationem sine errore contineant; sed propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiæ traditi sunt." (Cap. II. De Revel.) And in Canon IV. De Revelatione:

"Si quis sacræ Scripturæ libros integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout illos sancta Tridentina Synodus recensuit, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, aut eos divinitus inspiratos esse negaverit; anathema sit."

One of the bishops in the Council proposed an emendation to the decree for the reason that it is not the same to declare a book sacred as to declare it canonical. A book is sacred by inspiration; it is canonical by the approbation of the Church. Bishop Gasser ably answered that though the two terms, etymologically differed, in the concrete they were identical, for the books of the canon were both sacred and canonical. Canonicity does not pertain to the essence of inspiration but to its manifestation. The Council first declared the intrinsic character of inspiration, and then the external condition, that it be delivered to the Church as a divine book. Soon after the Vatican Council August Rohling published in Germany a treatise "De Bibliorum inspiratione ejusque valore ac vi pro libera scientia." Rohling distinguished between things of faith and morals, and profane things. In things of faith and morals the human writer was preserved from error by inspiration. In all things profane the writer was left to his own resources, and hence what he wrote was to be treated as the work of any uninspired historian. To distinguish between inspired and uninspired accessory matter, Rohling gave the criterion that

such matter was inspired only when it bore a necessary relation to religious truth, as for instance that Israel came to Mt. Sinai. This theory was ably refuted by Franzelin, "De Trad. et Script." pag. 564 sqq. Rohling's theory rests on a false principle that God inspires only a part of the Scriptures, whereas the Councils of the Church declare that they are all inspired with all their parts. The profane matter is inspired *per accidens*, that men might have a deposit of writings of infallible truth.

A far greater impetus was given to the tendency to limit inspiration by the work of the French orientalist, F. Lenormant. In his work, "Les Origines de l'histoire," 1880, he declares that all the Scripture is inspired, but all that is inspired is not infallibly true. In faith and morals the Scripture is an infallible guide, but this infallibility is not to be extended to other matters. The first eleven chapters of Genesis are myths serving to present religious ideas, but in the history the fabulous is inseparably intermingled. Lenormant speaks with great clearness. Of inspiration he says: "In regard to biblical questions one of which is here treated, I firmly believe the divine inspiration of the sacred books, and with perfect submission I accept the doctrinal decisions of the Church pertaining to inspiration, but I know that in these decisions inspiration is not extended beyond the things which relate to religion and the things of faith and morals, that is the supernatural teaching contained in the Scriptures. In other things the human faculties of the biblical writers is supreme. Everyone impressed his character on the style of his book. Regarding physical sciences, the writers had no special light; they followed the common opinions and prejudices of their times. 'The end of Scripture is,' says Cardinal Baronius, 'to teach us how to go to Heaven; not how the heavens move'; much less is it the end of Scripture to reveal how earthly things move through their changes. The Holy Ghost did not reveal scientific truths nor universal history." Applying his theory to Genesis he believes that in its first chapters it is a collection of myths and traditions common to all the peoples inhabiting about the Euphrates and Tigris. Under the influence of the

religion of Israel the polytheistic element has been eliminated from these traditions, and they became the instrument of conveying the high truths of the monotheistic religion of Israel. Lenormant differs from other non-Catholic orientalis. These assign an evolution of human conscience as the cause of a transition from the crude beliefs of polytheism to the more elevated character of monotheism in Israel. Lenormant invokes a special intervention of divine Providence inspiring the Law and the Prophets. Lenormant's work was placed on the Index by a decree of Dec. 19, 1887.

The theory of Lenormant was plainly contrary to the Catholic idea of the total inspiration of the Bible. It would no longer be a book of inspired truths, but a book in which inspired truths were intermingled with myth and fable. Many Catholic writers took up the defence of the Bible against Lenormant. Notable among these were Lefebvre (*Revue Catholique de Louvain*, 1880) Desjacques, Lamy, and Brucker (*La Controverse* 1881, 1882). Franz von Hummelauer (*Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, 1881) pointed out the danger of Lenormant's theories, declaring: "Er rückt sich mit Sack und Pack in die Linie der rationalistischen Erklärer ein."

Tentatively and cautiously Card. Newman advanced some views on inspiration in an article "On The Inspiration of Scripture" published in the *Nineteenth Century*, LXXXIV. Feb. 1884. In this article, inspiration and allied topics are studied. Card. Newman wrote his article to put the Church in a true light against the calumnies of Renan. The latter argued that the Catholic Church insisted on certain things which criticism and history proved to be impossible. Newman takes up to consider whether the Church does insist on matters in defiance of criticism and history. Hence, rather than the formulation of a theory of inspiration the great cardinal presents his view of what the Church insists on. Of inspiration he says:

"Now then, the main question before us being what it is that a Catholic is free to hold about Scripture in general, or about its separate portions or its statements, without compromising his firm inward assent to the dogmas of the Church,

that is, to the *de fide* enunciations of Pope and Councils, we have first of all to inquire how many and what those dogmas are."

"I answer that there are two dogmas; one relates to the authority of Scripture, the other to its interpretation. As to the authority of Scripture, we hold it to be, in all matters of faith and morals, divinely inspired throughout; as to its interpretation, we hold that the Church is, in faith and morals, the one infallible expounder of that inspired text.

"I begin with the question of its inspiration.

"The books which constitute the canon of Scripture, or the Canonical books, are enumerated by the Tridentine Council, as we find them in the first page of our Catholic Bibles, and are in that Ecumenical Council's decree spoken of by implication as the work of inspired men. The Vatican Council speaks more distinctly, saying that the entire books with all their parts, are divinely inspired, and adding an anathema upon impugnors of this definition.

"There is another dogmatic phrase used by the Councils of Florence and Trent to denote the inspiration of Scripture, viz., '*Deus unus et idem utriusque Testamenti Auctor.*' Since this left room for holding that by the word '*Testamentum*' was meant '*Dispensation*,' as it seems to have meant in former Councils from the date of Irenæus, and as St. Paul uses the word, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, the Vatican Council has expressly defined that the concrete *libri* themselves of the Old and New Testament '*Deum habent Auctorem.*'

"There is a further question, which is still left in some ambiguity, the meaning of the word '*Auctor.*' '*Auctor*' is not identical with the English word '*Author.*' Allowing that there are instances to be found in classical Latin in which '*auctores*' may be translated '*authors*,' instances in which it even seems to mean '*writers*,' it more naturally means '*authorities.*' Its proper sense is '*originator*,' '*inventor*,' '*founder*,' '*primary cause*;' (thus St. Paul speaks of our Lord as '*Auctor salutis*,' '*Auctor fidei*;) on the other hand, that it was inspired penmen who were the

'writers' of their works seems asserted by St. John and St. Luke and, I may say, in every paragraph of St. Paul's Epistles. In St. John we read, 'This is the disciple who testifies of these things, and has *written* these things,' and St. Luke says, 'I have thought it good to write to thee' &c. However, if any one prefers to construe 'auctor' as 'author' or writer, let it be so—only, then there will be two writers of the Scriptures, the divine and the human.

"And now comes the important question, in what respect are the Canonical books inspired? It cannot be in every respect, unless we are bound *de fide* to believe that 'terra in æternum stat', and that heaven is above us, and that there are no antipodes. And it seems unworthy of Divine Greatness, that the Almighty should in His revelation of Himself to us undertake mere secular duties, and assume the office of a narrator, as such, or an historian, or geographer, except so far as the secular matters bear directly upon the revealed truth. The Councils of Trent and the Vatican fulfil this anticipation; they tell us distinctly the object and the promise of Scripture inspiration. They specify 'faith and moral conduct' as the drift of that teaching which has the guarantee of inspiration. What we need and what is given us is not how to educate ourselves for this life; we have abundant natural gifts for human society, and for the advantages which it secures; but our great want is how to demean ourselves in thought and deed towards our Maker, and how to gain reliable information on this urgent necessity.

"Accordingly four times does the Tridentine Council insist upon 'faith and morality,' as the scope of inspired teaching. It declares that the 'Gospel' is 'the Fount of all *saving truth* and all *instruction in morals*,' that in the written books and in the unwritten traditions, the Holy Spirit dictating, this *truth* and *instruction are contained*. Then it speaks of the books and traditions, 'relating whether to *faith* or to *morals*,' and afterwards of 'the confirmation of *dogmas* and establishment of *morals*.' Lastly, it warns the Christian people, 'in matters of *faith* and *morals*,' against distorting Scripture into a sense of their own.

"In like manner the Vatican Council pronounces that Supernatural Revelation consists '*in rebus divinis*,' and is contained '*in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus*;' and it also speaks of '*petulantia ingenia*' advancing wrong interpretations of Scripture '*in rebus fidei et morum ad ædificationem doctrinæ Christianæ pertinentium*.'

"But while the Councils, as have been shown, lays down so emphatically the inspiration of Scripture in respect to faith and morals, it is remarkable that they do not say a word directly as to inspiration in matters of fact. Yet are we therefore to conclude that the record of facts in Scripture does not come under the guarantee of its inspiration? We are not so to conclude, and for this plain reason:—the sacred narrative carried on through so many ages, what is it but the very matter for our faith and rule of our obedience? What but that narrative itself is the supernatural teaching, in order to which inspiration is given? What is the whole history, traced out in Scripture from Genesis to Esdras and thence on to the end of the Acts of the Apostles, but a manifestation of Divine Providence, on the one hand interpretative, on a large scale and with analogical applications, of universal history, and on the other preparatory, typical and predictive, of the Evangelical Dispensation? Its pages breathe of providence and grace, of our Lord, and of His work and teaching, from beginning to end. It views facts in those relations in which neither ancients, such as the Greek and Latin classical historians, nor moderns, such as Niebuhr, Grote, Ewald, or Michelet, can view them. In this point of view it has God for its author, even though the finger of God traced no words but the Decalogue. Such is the claim of Bible history in its substantial fulness to be accepted *de fide* as true. In this point of view, Scripture is inspired, not only in faith and morals, but in all its parts which bear on faith, including matters of fact.

"But what has been said leads to another serious question. It is easy to imagine a Code of Laws inspired, or a formal prophecy, or a Hymn, or a Creed, or a collection of proverbs. Such works may be short, precise, and homogeneous; but inspiration on the one hand, and on the other a document,

multiform and copious in its contents, as the Bible is, are at first sight incompatible ideas, and destructive of each other. How are we practically to combine the indubitable fact of a divine superintendence with the indubitable fact of a collection of such various writings.

"Surely, then, if the revelations and lessons in Scripture are addressed to us personally and practically, the presence among us of a formal judge and standing expositor of its words is imperative. It is antecedently unreasonable to suppose that a book so complex, so systematic, in parts so obscure, the outcome of so many minds, times, and places should be given us from God without the safeguard of some authority; as if it could possibly, from the nature of the case, interpret itself. Its inspiration does but guarantee its truth, not its interpretation. How are private readers satisfactorily to distinguish what is didactic and what is historical, what is fact and what is vision, what is allegorical and what is literal, what is idiomatic and what is grammatical, what is enunciated formally and what occurs *obiter*, what is only of temporary and what is of lasting obligation? Such is our natural anticipation, and it is only too exactly justified in the events of the last three centuries, in the many countries where private judgment on the text of Scripture has prevailed. The gift of inspiration requires as its complement the gift of infallibility.

"Where then is this gift lodged, which is so necessary for the due use of the written word of God? Thus we are introduced to the second dogma in respect to Holy Scripture taught by the Catholic religion. The first is that Scripture is inspired, the second that the Church is the infallible interpreter of that inspiration."

"Such then is the answer which I make to the main question which has led to my writing. I asked what obligation of duty lay upon the Catholic scholar or man of science as regards his critical treatment of the text and the matter of Holy Scripture. And now I say that it is his duty, first, never to forget that what he is handling is the Word of God, which, by reason of the difficulty of always drawing the line between what is human and what is divine, cannot be put on

the level of other books, as it is now the fashion to do, but has the nature of a Sacrament, which is outward and inward and a channel of supernatural grace; and secondly, that in what he writes upon it or its separate books, he is bound to submit himself internally, and to profess to submit himself, in all that relates to faith and morals, to the definite teachings of Holy Church.

"This being laid down, let me go on to consider some of the critical distinctions and conclusions which are consistent with a faithful observance of these obligations.

"Are the books or are the writers inspired? I answer, Both. The Council of Trent says the writers ('*ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante*'); the Vatican says the books ('*si quis libros integros &c. divinitus inspiratos esse negaverit, anathema sit*'). Of course the Vatican decision is *de fide*, but it cannot annul the Tridentine. Both decrees are dogmatic truths. The Tridentine teaches us that the Divine Inspirer, inasmuch as he acted on the writer, acted, not immediately on the books themselves, but through the men who wrote them. The books are inspired, because the writers were inspired to write them. They are not inspired books, unless they came from inspired men.

"There is one instance in Scripture of Divine Inspiration without a human medium; the Decalogue was written by the very finger of God. He wrote the law upon the stone tables Himself. It has been thought the Urim and Thummim was another instance of the immediate inspiration of a material substance; but anyhow such instances are exceptional; certainly, as regards Scripture, which alone concerns us here, there always have been two minds in the process of inspiration, a Divine Auctor, and a human Scriptor; and various important consequences follow from this appointment.

"If there be at once a divine and a human mind co-operating in the formation of the sacred text, it is not surprising if there often be a double sense in that text, and, with obvious exceptions, never certain that there is not.

"Thus Sara had her human and literal meaning in her words, 'Cast out the bondwoman and her son,' &c.; but we

know from St. Paul that those words were inspired by the Holy Ghost to convey a spiritual meaning. Abraham, too, on the Mount, when his son asked him whence was to come the victim for the sacrifice which his father was about to offer, answered 'God will provide;' and he showed his own sense of his words afterwards, when he took the ram which was caught in the briers, and offered it as a holocaust. Yet those words were a solemn prophecy.

"And is it extravagant to say, that, even in the case of men who have no pretension to be prophets or servants of God, He may by their means give us great maxims and lessons, which the speakers little thought they were delivering? as in the case of the Architrachus in the marriage feast, who spoke of the bridegroom as having 'kept the good wine until now;' words which it was needless for St. John to record, unless they had a mystical meaning.

"Such instances raise the question whether the Scripture saints and prophets always understood the higher and divine sense of their words. As to Abraham, this will be answered in the affirmative; but I do not see reason for thinking that Sara was equally favoured. Nor is her case solitary; Caiaphas as high priest, spoke a divine truth by virtue of his office, little thinking of it, when he said that 'one man must die for the people;' and St. Peter at Joppa at first did not see beyond a literal sense in his vision, though he knew that there was a higher sense, which in God's good time would be revealed to him.

"And hence there is no difficulty in supposing that the Prophet Osee, though inspired, only knew his own literal sense of the words which he transmitted to posterity, 'I have called my Son out of Egypt,' the further prophetic meaning of them being declared by St. Matthew in his gospel. And such a divine sense would be both concurrent with and confirmed by that antecedent belief which prevailed among the Jews in St. Matthew's time, that their sacred books were in great measure typical, with an evangelical bearing, though as yet they might not know what those books contained in prospect.

"Nor is it *de fide* (for that alone with a view to Catholic Biblicists I am considering) that inspired men, at the time when they speak from inspiration, should always know that the Divine Spirit is visiting them.

"The Psalms are inspired; but, when David, in the outpouring of his deep contrition, disburdened himself before his God in the words of the *Miserere*, could he, possibly, while uttering them, have been directly conscious that every word he uttered was not simply his, but another's? Did he not think that he was personally asking forgiveness and spiritual help?

"Doubt again seems incompatible with a consciousness of being inspired. But Father Patrizi, while reconciling two Evangelists in a passage of their narratives, says, if I understand him rightly (ii. p. 405), that though we admit that there were some things about which inspired writers doubted, this does not imply that inspiration allowed them to state what is doubtful as certain, but only it did not hinder them from stating things with a doubt in their minds about them; but how can the All-knowing Spirit doubt? or how can an inspired man doubt, if he is conscious of his inspiration?

"And again, how can a man whose hand is guided by the Holy Spirit, and who knows it, make apologies for his style of writing, as if deficient in literary exactness and finish? If then the writer of Ecclesiasticus, at the very time that he wrote his Prologue, was not only inspired but conscious of his inspiration, how could he have entreated his readers to 'come with benevolence,' and to make excuse for his 'coming short in the composition of words'? Surely, if at the very time he wrote he had known it, he would, like other inspired men, have said, 'Thus saith the Lord,' or what was equivalent to it.

"The same remark applies to the writer of the second book of Machabees, who ends his narrative by saying, 'If I have done well, it is what I desired, but if not so perfectly, it must be pardoned me.' What a contrast to St. Paul, who, speaking of his inspiration (I Cor. VII. 40) and of his 'weakness and fear' (*ibid.* II. 4), does so in order to *boast* that

his 'speech was, not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in the showing of the Spirit and of power.' The historian of the Machabees, would have surely adopted a like tone of 'glorying,' had he had at the time a like consciousness of his divine gift.

"Again, it follows from there being two agencies, divine grace and human intelligence, co-operating in the production of the Scriptures, that, whereas, if they were written, as in the Decalogue, by the immediate finger of God, every word of them must be His and His only; on the contrary, if they are man's writing, informed and quickened by the presence of the Holy Ghost, they admit, should it so happen, of being composed of outlying materials, which have passed through the minds and from the fingers of inspired penmen, and are known to be inspired on the ground that those who were the immediate editors, as they may be called, were inspired.

"For an example of this we are supplied by the writer of the second book of Machabees, to which reference has already been made. 'All such things,' says the writer, 'as have been comprised in five books by Jason of Cyrene, we have attempted to abridge in one book.' Here we have the human aspect of an inspired work. Jason need not, the writer of the second book of Machabees must, have been inspired.

"Again; St. Luke's gospel is inspired, as having gone through and come forth from an inspired mind; but the extrinsic sources of his narrative were not necessarily all inspired any more than was Jason of Cyrene; yet such sources there were, for, in contrast with the testimony of the actual eye-witnesses of the events which he records, he says of himself that he wrote after a careful inquiry, 'according as *they* delivered them to us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word;' as to himself, he had but 'diligently attained to all things from the beginning.' Here it was not the original statements, but his edition of them, which needed to be inspired.

"Hence we have no reason to be surprised, nor is it against the faith to hold, that a canonical book may be composed, not only from, but even of, pre-existing documents, it being always borne in mind, as a necessary condition, that

an inspired mind has exercised a supreme and an ultimate judgment on the work, determining what was to be selected and embodied in it, in order to its truth in all 'matters of faith and morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine,' and its unadulterated truth.

"Thus Moses may have incorporated in his manuscript as much from foreign documents as is commonly maintained by the critical school; yet the existing Pentateuch, with the miracles which it contains, may still (from that personal inspiration which belongs to a prophet) have flowed from his mind and hand on to his composition. He new-made and authenticated what till then was no matter of faith.

"This being considered, it follows that a book may be, and may be accepted as, inspired, though not a word of it is an original document. Such is almost the case with the first book of Esdras. A learned writer in a publication of the day* says: 'It consists of the contemporary historical journals, kept from time to time by the prophets or other authorized persons who were eye-witnesses for the most part of what they record, and whose several narratives were afterwards strung together, and either abridged or added to, as the case required, by a later hand, of course an inspired hand.'

"And in like manner the Chaldee and Greek portions of the book of Daniel, even though not written by Daniel, may be, and we believe are, written by penmen inspired in matters of faith and morals; and so much, and nothing beyond, does the Church 'oblige' us to believe.

"I have said that the Chaldee, as well as the Hebrew portion of Daniel requires, in order to its inspiration, not that it should be Daniel's writing, but that its writer, whoever he was, should be inspired. This leads me to the question whether inspiration requires and implies that the book inspired should in its form and matter be homogeneous, and all its parts belong to each other. Certainly not. The book of Psalms is the obvious instance destructive of any such

* Smith's *Dictionary*.

idea. What it really requires is an inspired Editor;* that is, an inspired mind, authoritative in faith and morals, from whose fingers the sacred text passed. I believe it is allowed generally, that at the date of the captivity and under the persecution of Antiochus, the books of Scripture and the sacred text suffered much loss and injury. Originally the Psalms seem to have consisted of five books; of which only a portion, perhaps the first and second, were David's. That arrangement is now broken up, and the Council of Trent was so impressed with the difficulty of their authorship, that, in its formal decree respecting the Canon, instead of calling the collection 'David's Psalms,' as was usual, they called it the 'Psalterium Davidicum,' thereby meaning to imply, that although canonical and inspired and in spiritual fellowship and relationship with those of 'the choice Psalmist of Israel,' the whole collection is not therefore necessarily the writing of David.

"And as the name of David, though not really applicable to every Psalm, nevertheless protected and sanctioned them all, so the appendices which conclude the book of Daniel, Susanna and Bel, though not belonging to the main history, come under the shadow of the Divine Presence which primarily rests on what goes before.

"And so again, whether or not the last verses of St. Mark's, and two portions of St. John's Gospel, belong to those Evangelists respectively, matters not as regards their inspiration; for the Church has recognised them as portions of that sacred narrative which precedes or embraces them.

"Nor does it matter whether one or two Isaiahs wrote the book which bears that Prophet's name; the Church, without settling this point, pronounces it inspired in respect of faith and morals, both Isaiahs being inspired; and, if

* This representation must not be confused with either of the two views of Canonicity which are pronounced insufficient by the Vatican Council—viz. 1, that in order to be sacred and canonical, it is enough for a book to be a work of mere human industry, provided it be afterwards approved by the authorities of the Church; and 2, that it is enough if it contains revealed teaching without error. Neither of these views supposes the presence of inspiration, whether in the writer or the writing; what is contemplated above is an inspired writer in the exercise of his inspiration, and a work inspired from first to last under the action of that inspiration.

this be assured to us, all other questions are irrelevant and unnecessary."

"Nor do the Councils forbid our holding that there are interpolations or additions in the sacred text, say, the last chapter of the Pentateuch, provided they are held to come from an inspired penman, such as Esdras, and are thereby authoritative in faith and morals.

"From what has been last said it follows, that the titles of the Canonical books, and their ascription to different authors, either do not come under their inspiration, or need not be accepted literally.

"For instance: the Epistle to the Hebrews is said in our Bibles to be the writing of St. Paul, and so virtually it is, and to deny that it is so in any sense might be temerarious; but its authorship is not a matter of faith as its inspiration is, but an acceptance of received opinion, and because to no other writer can it be so well assigned.

"Again, the 89th Psalm has for its title 'A Prayer of Moses,' yet that has not hindered a succession of Catholic writers, from Athanasius to Bellarmine, from denying it to be his.

"Again, the Book of Wisdom professes (*e. g.*, chs. vii. and ix.) to be written by Solomon; yet our Bibles say, 'It is written in the *person* of Solomon,' and 'it is uncertain who was the writer;' and St. Augustine, whose authority had so much influence in the settlement of the Canon, speaking of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, says: 'The two books by reason of a certain similarity of style are usually called Solomon's though the more learned have no doubt they do not belong to him.' (Martin. *Pref. to Wisdom and Eccl.*; Aug. *Opp.* t. iii. p. 733.)

"If these instances hold, they are precedents for saying that it is no sin against the faith (for of such I have all along been speaking), nor indeed, if done conscientiously and on reasonable grounds, any sin, to hold that Ecclesiastes is not the writing of Solomon, in spite of its opening with a profession of being his; and that first, because that profession is a heading, not a portion of the book; secondly, because, even though it be part of the book, a like profession is made

in the Book of Wisdom, without its being a proof that 'Wisdom' is Solomon's; and thirdly, because such a profession may well be considered a prosopopœia not so difficult to understand as that of the Angel Raphael, when he called himself 'the Son of the great Ananias.'

"On this subject Melchior Canus says: 'It does not much matter to the Catholic Faith, that a book was written by this or that writer, so long as the Spirit of God is believed to be the author of it; which Gregory delivers and explains, in his Preface to Job, 'It matters not with what pen the King has written his letter, if it be true that He has written it.' (*Loc. Th.* p. 44.)

"I say then of the Book of Ecclesiastes, its authorship is one of those questions which still lie in the hands of the Church. If the Church formally declared that it was written by Solomon, I consider that, in accordance with its heading (and, as implied in what follows, as in 'Wisdom,') we should be bound, recollecting that she has the gift of judging '*de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum Sanctarum,*' to accept such a decree as a matter of faith; and in like manner, in spite of its heading, we should be bound to accept a contrary decree, if made to the effect that the book was not Solomon's. At present as the Church (or Pope) has not pronounced on one side or on the other, I conceive that, till a decision comes from Rome, either opinion is open to the Catholic without any impeachment of his faith.

"And here I am led on to inquire whether *obiter dicta* are conceivable in an inspired document. We know that they are held to exist and even required in treating of the dogmatic utterances of Popes, but are they compatible with inspiration? The common opinion is that they are not. Professor Lamy thus writes about them, in the form of an objection: 'Many minute matters occur in the sacred writers which have regard only to human feebleness and the natural necessities of life, and by no means require inspiration, since they can otherwise be perfectly well known, and seem scarcely worthy of the Holy Spirit, as for instance what is said of the dog of Tobias, St. Paul's *penula*, and the salutations at the end of the Epistles.' Neither he nor Fr. Patrizi

allow of these exceptions; but Fr. Patrizi, as Lamy quotes him, 'damnare non audet eos qui hæc tenerent,' viz., exceptions, and he himself, by keeping silence, seems unable to condemn them either.

"By *obiter dicta* in Scripture I also mean such statements as we find in the Book of Judith, that Nabuchodonosor was king of Nineve. Now it is in favour of there being such unauthoritative *obiter dicta*, that unlike those which occur in dogmatic utterances of Popes and Councils, they are, in Scripture, not doctrinal, but mere unimportant statements of fact; whereas those of Popes and Councils may relate to faith and morals, and are said to be uttered *obiter*, because they are not contained within the scope of the formal definition, and imply no intention of binding the consciences of the faithful. There does not then seem any serious difficulty in admitting their existence in Scripture. Let it be observed, its miracles are doctrinal facts, and in no sense of the phrase can be considered *obiter dicta*.

"It may be questioned, too, whether the absence of chronological sequence might not be represented as an infringement of plenary inspiration, more serious than the *obiter dicta* of which I have been speaking. Yet St. Matthew is admitted by approved commentators to be unsolicitous as to order of time. So says Fr. Patrizi (*De Evang.* lib.ii. p. 1), viz., 'Matthæum de observando temporis ordine minime sollicitum esse.' He gives instances, and then repeats, 'Matthew did not observe order of time.' If such absence of order is compatible with inspiration in St. Matthew, as it is, it might be consistent with inspiration in parts of the Old Testament, supposing they are open to re-arrangement in chronology. Does not this teach us to fall back upon the decision of the Councils that 'faith and morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine' are the scope, the true scope, of inspiration? And is not the Holy See the judge given us for determining what is for edification and what is not?"

In the Irish Ecclesiastical Record of March, 1884, Rev. John Healy (afterward Bishop Healy) published an article in which he dissented from Card. Newman. As Healy's

article seems to us to express a clear statement of the Catholic doctrine we reproduce it here nearly in full: "With regard to the Cardinal's views on the interpretation of Scripture, we have nothing to say; he merely expresses the common teaching of theologians on this point. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves to the first question which he discusses—the authority or inspiration of Sacred Scripture.

"In answer to his own question on this point—What is *de fide* with regard to the inspiration of Scripture? his reply is:—'As to the authority of Scripture, we hold it to be, in all matters of faith and morals, divinely inspired throughout.' In No. 11 he tells us that the Councils of Trent and the Vatican 'specify "faith and moral conduct" as the 'drift' of that teaching (in Scripture) which has the guarantee of inspiration.' In No. 12 he says that the Vatican Council pronounces that supernatural Revelation consists 'in rebus divinis,' and is *contained*—the italics are not ours—'in libris scriptis et sine scriptis traditionibus.' And finally, in No. 13, he asserts that while the Councils, as has been shown, lay down so emphatically the inspiration of Scripture in respect to 'faith and morals,' it is remarkable that they do not say a word directly as to its inspiration in 'matters of fact;' and hence he raises the question—but does not answer it—whether there may not be in Scripture, as there are in the dogmatic utterances of Popes and Councils, *obiter dicta*, 'unimportant "statements of fact," not inspired, and therefore unauthoritative' (No. 26), and, we may add, not even necessarily true.

"The merest tyro in the schools of Catholic theology will at once perceive the startling character of these statements, and the pregnant consequences which they involve. Hence we propose to examine them very briefly, in order to ascertain if the *de fide* utterances of the Church on this matter of the inspiration of the sacred volume are exactly of the character described by Card. Newman; and we shall for the most part confine ourselves to an analysis of these dogmatic utterances themselves.

"Of course, when the Cardinal says it is *de fide* that Scripture, in all matters of faith and morals, is divinely in-

spired throughout, he says what is true; but he certainly seems to imply that it is not *de fide* that Scripture is inspired in those things (if there be any such) which are not 'matters of faith and morals.' Now, here precisely we join issue, and we say that, in our opinion, the Catholic dogma, as defined both in the Council of Trent and the Vatican, admits of no such restricting clause; that it is adequately and accurately expressed only by eliminating that clause; or, in other words, the Catholic dogma is, to borrow some of the Cardinal's own words, that Sacred Scripture is divinely inspired *throughout*.

"The Council of Trent first enumerates the books that constitute the canon of Scripture, and then, in the strictest language, formulates its decree in the following words:— '*Si quis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri vulgata latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, et traditiones praedictas sciens et prudens contempserit, anathema sit.*'* There is here no restriction of inspiration or canonicity to matters of faith and morals; the *entire* books, with *all their parts*, are declared to be sacred and canonical, that is, inspired Scripture, recognised as such by the Church; for, as we shall see, that is the meaning of sacred and canonical, as applied by the Council of Trent and of the Vatican to the books of Scripture. If we take the expression 'entire books, with all their parts,' to be equivalent to the Cardinal's word *throughout*, we have a right to conclude that the Catholic dogma, as enunciated in that canon, proclaims that these canonical books are inspired *throughout*, and therefore not merely in questions of faith and morals.

"Lest there might be any doubt of the meaning of the expression 'pro sacris et canonicis,' we beg to append the analogous canon in the Vatican Council, which, in our opinion, leaves no doubt about the matter. Here it is:—'*Si quis sacrae Scripturae libros integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout illos Sancta Tridentina Synodus recensuit, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, aut eos divinitus inspiratos esse*

* Quarta Sessio, Decr. de Canonicis Scripturis.

negaverit, anathema sit.' (Can. 4, De Revelatione.) It is impossible to enunciate in clearer language the great Catholic truth, that the *entire* books of Sacred Scripture, *with all their parts*, are divinely inspired; or in other words, that the books of Sacred Scripture are inspired *throughout*. If any one should urge that perhaps 'eos,' in the last clause of this canon is not necessarily the exact equivalent of the subject of the preceding clause, our answer is, that both grammatically and logically 'eos' and 'illos' stand for the subject of the preceding clause, and are therefore exactly co-extensive with it. At any rate, the Council pronounces the *entire* books—eos, scil. libros *integros*—to be inspired, without making any distinction between 'matters of fact' and 'matters of faith and morals,' and that is quite enough for our argument.

"Every one trained in theological discipline knows that it is not always easy to ascertain, from the wording in the body of a dogmatic chapter of a General Council, what is strictly and exactly *de fide*. But when a Council wishes to express Catholic dogma with the utmost accuracy and exactness, it formulates it as a canon, and pronounces anathema against the gainsayers. I have a right, therefore, to infer from this canon, as a Catholic dogma, that Sacred Scripture, without exception or restriction, is inspired throughout.

"Cardinal Newman says that the dogmatic phrase used by the Councils of Florence and Trent to denote the inspiration of Scripture, viz., that one and the same God was the author of both Testaments—*Deus unus et idem utriusque Testamenti Auctor*—left some room for holding that the word 'Testament' might mean 'Dispensation, rather than the Books of the Testaments, although he admits that the Vatican Council has settled the question by inserting the word "books."

"It appears to us that the Council of Florence left no doubt about the matter, for it has explained the meaning of the word 'Testament' in its decree, as may be seen in so common a book as Franzelin (*De Inspir. S. Scrip. Thesis. II., No. 1.*) Here are the words:—

“‘Firmissime credit, profitetur et praedicat (Sacrosancta Rom. Ecclesia) unum verum Deum Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum creatorem. . . . Unum atque eundem Deum Veteris et Novi Testamenti, *hoc est, Legis et Prophetarum atque Evangelii profitetur Auctorem, quoniam eodem Spiritu Sancto inspirante utriusque Testamenti sancti locuti sunt*, quorum libros suscipit et veneratur, qui titulis sequentibus continentur.’

“Surely the expression ‘Old and New Testament,’ when explained to mean ‘the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel,’ can mean nothing else but the Sacred Books that commonly go under these names.

“But if there could be any doubt about the matter it would be removed by the reason that is subjoined—God is the author of the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel, *because* it was under the inspiration of His Holy Spirit that the saints of both Testaments *spoke*, whose books, therefore, the Council receives and venerates. The word ‘*locuti*’ evidently refers to the *written word*, as in 2 *Peter* I., 21, and, in conjunction with *libros*, clearly shows that by Testament the Council meant the *books* of the Old and New Testament—that is, as it explains, the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospels.

“It is difficult to see how this explanation given by the Council itself can be reconciled with the statement that the Councils of Florence and Trent left the meaning of the word Testament in the phrase referred to somewhat doubtful. The Council of Florence certainly did not; and, Pallavicini tells us, the Council of Trent, in framing its decree, was careful to follow the very words of the Council of Florence.*

“It is defined both by the Councils of Trent and of Florence, that God is the *auctor utriusque Testamenti*, and as we have just seen, that is the same as to say he is the *author* of all the books of the Old and New Testament; and so it has been expressly defined by the Vatican Council, as the Cardinal himself admits. But, he says, the Latin word *auctor* still leaves some ambiguity, for it is not equivalent to the

* Hist. Concil. Trid. Lib. VI. c. 11, n. 11-14.

English word *author*. That may be very true, when there is question of the words *auctor* and *author* in their generic sense; it is too delicate a point for us to discuss, and it is quite unnecessary to discuss it. For there is no question now of the *generic* meaning, which as Cardinal Franzelin clearly points out (Thesis III., No. 1.) is determined by the context, that is, by the special efficiency of which there is question. Generically, both in English and Latin, 'author' means the person who gives origin or authority to anything, but in its specific sense the meaning will very much depend on the kind of origin or authority of which there is question. The same may be the author of a law, the author of a book, and the author of a crime, but in very different senses. Now it is *de fide* that God is the author of *the Books* of the Old and New Testament, and will the Cardinal undertake to say, that when thus used in regard to books, *auctor* in classical Latin is not equivalent to 'author' when said in reference to books in English? We do not pretend to the Cardinal's knowledge of classical Latin, but we know something of ecclesiastical Latin, as used by the Councils of Trent and Florence, and we are quite sure that *auctor libri* in ecclesiastical Latin is pretty much the same as the 'author of a book' in English.

"It is *de fide*, therefore, that God is the author of all the Books of the Old and New Testament; and we have seen that it is *de fide* that they are inspired throughout, whole and entire, without any distinction between 'matters of fact' and 'matters of faith and morals.' Well, now, in No. 11, the Cardinal asks, in what respect are the Canonical Books inspired? 'It cannot be in every respect,' he says, 'except we are bound *de fide* to believe that 'terra in aeternum stat,' that heaven is above us, and that there are no antipodes.' If by 'respect' is meant every signification which a word of phrase might have, scientific or popular, literal or metaphorical, he is evidently right; but then it is hardly necessary to tell us so. Surely the phrases 'terra in aeternum stat,' 'and heaven is above us,' 'the sun rises,' and the like, have a popular meaning which is perfectly true, and which might

be revealed by God, and which if revealed by God, incidentally or otherwise, in that popular sense, we should be bound to believe it *de fide*.

"But apparently this is not what Cardinal Newman means, for in the next sentence he says: 'And it seems unworthy of Divine greatness that the Almighty should, in His revelation of Himself to us, undertake mere secular duties, and assume the office of a narrator as such, of a historian, or geographer, except so far as the secular matters bear directly on the revealed truth.' Does any one assert that God in His Revelation undertakes the office of narrator, *as such*, or historian, or geographer? We thought it was a well-known distinction made by Catholic theologians of every school between the things revealed *propter se*, or, as the Cardinal calls them, matters of faith and morals, and things revealed *per accidens*, including every other statement made in Sacred Scripture, whether in narration, history, geography, or anything else. God reveals none of these things *propter se*. He does not undertake the work of annalist, historian, geographer, *as such*. They are revealed on account of their connection, necessary, useful, or accidental as the case may be, with the main purposes of Divine Revelation. But as Benedict XII. in his Dogmatic Catalogue of the Errors of the Armenians very clearly signifies, they must be all believed even those which have been revealed *per accidens*, because they are all equally the word of God, and all serve a useful purpose in the Divine economy of our salvation.* 'For *whatsoever* things were written, were written for our learning; that through patience and the comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope.' *Rom. XV. 4.*

"And what is man that he should undertake to pronounce what is worthy, or what is unworthy of Divine Majesty? If we were to attempt to do so, especially in God's revelation, where should we stop? Does not the Socinian think it unworthy of God to reveal mysteries? The Rationalist, for a somewhat similar reason, denies miracles. The ordinary

* See Franzelin note, Thesis iii. p. 352. The 114th error in the Catalogue seems to consist in the fact that the Armenians assumed a historical statement in Genesis to be *false*.

protestant contends that the Catholic teaching about the Blessed Eucharist is utterly unworthy of God, and so he gives up the literal, and adopts a metaphorical sense. It is the old story—*Durus est hic sermo, et quis potest eum audire?* Our reply is—*Quis cognovit sensum domini, qui instruat eum?* Human wisdom left to itself would say that of all unworthy things the most unworthy of God was to redeem the word by the 'folly' of the cross; and it did say it by the mouth both of Jew and Gentile.

"We have no objection to the statement that faith and moral conduct is the 'drift' of the teaching that has the guarantee of inspiration, or that the Council of Trent insists on faith and morality as the 'scope' of inspired teaching, provided always it is not thereby implied that Scripture is not also inspired throughout, even in those things which to us seem to have least connection with faith and morals. It is in this sense and in no other sense the Council of Trent speaks. In the *preamble* of the chapter it states, as Cardinal Newman says, that faith and morality is the 'scope' of inspired teaching, and that the Gospel is the 'fount' of all saving truth and all instruction in morals; and this is perfectly true, but the *main proposition* to which everything else is incidental is contained in the following words, which necessarily imply the inspiration of every single statement made by sacred writers. 'Sacrosancta. . . . Synodus . . . orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, necnon traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas et continua successione in ecclesia Catholica conservatas pari pietatis affectu et reverentia suscipit et veneratur.' From the beginning of the chapter to the word *veneratur* is one single sentence; the last part, as written by us, contains the main assertion, the purport of which is perfectly clear: that as God is the author of all the books of the Old and New Testament, and, as the divine traditions regarding faith and morals were either spoken by Christ himself or dictated by His Holy Spirit, therefore the Council accepts and venerates both with equal affection of

piety and reverence—and why? because they are both equally the Word of God. It must be carefully observed that the words ‘tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes’—refer only to the traditions, and have nothing at all to do with the preceding words. And they were inserted, as Pallavicini tells us, in order to distinguish the divine traditions, of which God is the author, and which concern faith and morals, from purely apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, which are of their own nature disciplinary and mutable. So far, therefore, is the Council of Trent from lending any countenance to the idea that all Scripture is not inspired, that it distinctly affirms the divine authorship of all the books of Sacred Scripture, and we have seen, pronounces anathema against those who would dare to assert that they are not ‘sacred and canonical,’ and inspired Scripture throughout.

“There is one point to be carefully kept in mind in any discussion on this important question, if we wish to avoid grave errors—the difference between *inspiration* and *revelation*. Inspiration, as we shall see further on, in its plenary sense, implies three things, the Divine afflatus moving, enlightening, and guiding the writer—*inspiratio active sumpta*: the *state* of the human agent under this Divine influence—*inspiratio passive sumpta*; and, lastly, the product of the combined action of God and man, that is, the book written by the Holy Spirit through man’s agency—which is *inspiratio terminative sumpta*. Inspiration therefore, in reference to Sacred Scripture, essentially regards the *writing*—the writing *in fieri*, and the writing *in facto esse*. Not so in the case of revelation. It need have no connection with inspired writing at all. In its active sense it is simply the Divine manifestation of hidden things, and sometimes of things not previously hidden; in its objective sense it merely means the things so made known by God. Inspiration, therefore, necessarily implies revelation in the wide sense given above; but revelation, as in the case of Divine traditions not contained in Scripture, may have nothing at all to do with inspiration. Let our readers bear this in mind, for the Cardinal goes on to say that ‘the Vatican Council pronounces that supernatural *revelation* consists *in rebus Divinis*, and is con-

tained in libris scriptis, et sine scriptis traditionibus,' italicising as above, and implying thereby, it seems to us, that all Sacred Scripture is not necessarily Divine truth or a Divine revelation, and that revelation and inspiration are identical.

"What the Council says on the first point is contained in the following sentence, and certainly will not admit the meaning given above by implication:—'Huic Divinae revelationi tribuendum quidem est, ut ea, quae *in rebus Divinis* humanae rationi per se impervia non sunt, in presenti quoque generis humani conditione ab omnibus expedite, firma certitudine, et nullo admixto errore cognosci possint.'" I do not think the Council declares in that sentence that revelation consists 'in things Divine,' but even if it does, then all we can say is, that every statement in Scripture is Divine, or, what comes to the same, is the Word of God—as St. Paul himself asserts, at least by implication, regarding the Scriptures certainly of the Old Testament, if not also of some of the New, *πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος*. If every scripture is *θεόπνευστος* it may well be called Divine.

"As regards the second point, the Council does say that the supernatural *revelation* is *contained* in the written books and unwritten Divine traditions; but concerning these same books it says in the very next sentence, that the church does not regard them as sacred and canonical, merely because they *contain* this *revelation* without error, but because, having *been written* under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have God for their author, and as such have been handed down to the church. 'Eos vero (libros) ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet, non ideo quod sola humana industria concinnati, sua deinde auctoritate sint approbati, nec ideo dumtaxat, quod *revelationem* sine errore contineant; sed propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi ecclesiae traditi sunt.' To say, therefore, that the Divine books contain the revelation of God, and even without any error, is declared by the Council itself to be an inadequate description of their sacred and canonical character.* The reason is manifest. A book

* See Franz. page 375 Thesis IV.

might contain the whole revelation of God, and contain it without error, and yet not be at all an inspired book, because inspiration essentially regards the writing or authorship of the book. If it is an inspired book, God is its author; it must have been written in all its parts under the guidance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God, so much so, that God becomes responsible for every single statement it contains, and therefore quite as much responsible for its statements 'in matters of fact,' as for its statements in reference to 'faith and morals.' All these truths will not have the same intrinsic importance in relation to each other, or to the economy of man's redemption; but they are all divine as regards their origin and their authority.

"And now this leads us to give, in conclusion, a very brief explanation of the nature of inspiration as taught in all Catholic schools, and it is as contained in the writings of the Fathers, and of all our eminent theologians, since the Council of Trent. Catholic teaching on this point has become still more definite and dogmatic since the definitions of the Council of the Vatican already referred to.

"The points of Catholic dogma clearly defined are, (a) that God is the author of all the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, (b) that these books have been *written* under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God, (c) and hence the entire books are inspired. The second of these points more clearly and accurately defines the meaning of the first; and the third expresses the abiding consequence of the other two, that is, the inspiration of the sacred books *terminative*, as the theologians call it.

"God, then, is defined to be the author of all the Sacred Scriptures, *because* they were written under the inspiration of His Holy Spirit. Now, what is meant by being the author of a book in this sense? It must mean here, as it means everywhere else, either that He Himself wrote it, as He wrote the Tables of the Law, with his own finger, which, of course, is out of the question; or that he dictated the sacred books word for word to the inspired penmen, an opinion which has been held by few, but is now justly and generally rejected; or finally, as a *minimum*, it must mean according to the use

of language, that He directed or procured the writing of all these sacred books; that He suggested to the sacred writers all the *matter* to be written—*res et sententias*—even that known before, and finally gave them such constant, ever watchful assistance in the composition of all these books as to insure that everything which He wished should be said, and that nothing should be said except what He wished, and hence that there should be no trace of falsehood or error, for which He, the principal and infallible Author of the book, would, in that absurd hypothesis, be held responsible. The very nature of Divine authorship requires this at least; if the instrumental author begin to write *motu proprio*, it is in no special sense God's work; if he write anything which he is not directed to write, it is not God's work so far; and if there could be errors or mistakes in any book written by Divine authority, God could never claim that book whole and entire, with all its parts, as purely and simply His own—as written in its entirety under the inspiration of His Holy Spirit. Therefore, the Divine authorship of the Sacred Books, in the sense *defined by the Church*, imperatively requires that as a *minimum*, the impulse to write should come from God, that He should suggest at least the matter, and that He should preserve the sacred writers from all error, which, if it were possible, would not be the error of man, but of God. It is as absurd to say that a man could commit sin under the impulse of the Holy Ghost, as to say that the sacred writer could write error under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Therefore, as it is *de fide* that the Sacred Books, whole and entire, were written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, it follows, at least as a conclusion theologically certain, that everything written by the sacred writers is, what is called in Scripture, and by the Church, and by the Fathers, and by the people, verily and indeed the Word of God, unmixed with any false, or erroneous, or *merely* human element.

“This doctrine, regarding the nature of inspiration, does not imply that God did not, in most cases, leave the choice of the words to the sacred writer. It does not even imply that the words chosen were the most elegant, or most appropriate, for expressing the Divine ideas in the writer's mind. It does

not imply the adoption of the graces of style, nor the niceties of grammar, nor the exactness in scientific or rhetorical arrangement. But it does imply that the words must be suitable to express the writer's Divine thoughts, that his language must be intelligible, and that the arrangement must not be such as will necessarily lead the readers astray.

"Again, inspiration does not exclude antecedent knowledge of much of the matter to be written, nor labor in its acquisition, provided always it is written by the human author of the sacred Book, not *motu proprio*, but in virtue of the Divine impulse, consciously or unconsciously followed, and written also under the Divine guidance, lest any error might creep in, of which, as it could not originate from God, He could not accept the authorship or responsibility.

"Neither does our doctrine on inspiration imply that it is confined to the autograph of the sacred writer. Inspiration does not, *terminative* sumpta, consist in the *material* book as such—in the handwriting, the ink, and the vellum; but it consists in the book as a series of signs, with a definite objective significance for the mind of man: and hence the inspired books remain, although the autographs have all perished."

Others who opposed the views of Newman were Brucker (La Controverse et le Contemporain), and Corluy in the same periodical. Later Brucker published his views in a work entitled "Questions Actuelles d'Ecriture Sainte." In Germany Franz Schmid vigorously opposed Newman's theory.

In 1889 Salvatore di Bartolo published his "I Criteri Teologici." This was placed on the Index of prohibited books by the decree of May 14, 1891. A corrected edition which appeared at Rome in 1904 is permitted to be read. The most widely circulated form of this work is a French edition with certain additions by the translator. This was made from the proscribed edition. Di Bartolo aimed to bring about a union between the Catholic Church and all those who dissent from it by keeping in abeyance everything non essential on which there is difference of view, and insisting only on the things that are *clearly revealed*, and on the things of common belief of all Christians. Applying this theory to

inspiration he says: "Inspiration is a supernatural assistance acting on the intelligence and will of the sacred writer, and causing him to write the true doctrine in things of faith and morals, and true facts which are essentially connected with things of faith and morals; and to write other things with a sincere purpose and divine commission to save mankind."

Explaining his meaning he declares inspiration to be such a co-operation of the Holy Ghost that the whole Scripture should be attributed to the Holy Ghost as its author." Conceding that the Church has defined the divine authorship, di Bartolo affirms "that the Church has never determined the constituent elements of inspiration, and that theologians are not agreed as to its nature." Hence this author gives a very wide stretch to the free ground in this great question. The substance of his own views may be summed up as follows: Inspiration has three degrees. In the things of faith and morals and facts essentially therewith connected the highest degree of inspiration takes place, even at times extending to the very words. Whenever there is a doubt of the degree of inspiration the presumption is in favor of the biblical expression until the clearest arguments force us to admit the evidence of the human element. Inspiration is not present in all sentences, neither always in the forms of expression.

The least degree of inspiration is present in the accessories to the things narrated in Scripture, and here inspiration does not guarantee infallibility. Here therefore not all doubt, equivocation, and error are excluded. These things are not to be said to the common people who are unable to make the necessary distinctions; but di Bartolo believes it not irreverent to speak of an error in the material part of Scripture. Such opinion, he says, offends not God, for the error is not attributed to God, but to his secretary. If the Son of God in his incarnation had natural imperfections; if God permitted errors gradually to creep into the text of the Scriptures as they were preserved by men, why could not God permit his secretary the inspired writer to commit certain defects in the narration of accessory things, when they

could not be imputed to God, but to the writer whom God employed? It conflicts not with inspiration when the writer uses old documents, therefore, why should it be excluded by inspiration that a writer in secondary things should commit equivocations? that he should follow popular beliefs? that he should fall into error? God, permitting that human weakness should be manifested, saved intact the entire divine message. The least degree of inspiration is present in things non-religious in character, and here the human element is not guaranteed infallibility. There is a certain inspiration here; for the writer had a special commission to write for the salvation of men, and his end in writing was good. Inspiration extends itself to all the sacred writers have written; but in these accessory and non-religious things it is the least degree of inspiration, which leaves more to the human factor. Therefore the writer being by nature limited and fallible, he may in these secondary things err and doubt. To the non-religious order of Scripture pertain geography, chronology, natural history, physics, defective philosophy perhaps, and defects in literary style.

Though di Bartolo's views are in some things extreme, and rightly condemned, there is every evidence that he wrote in good faith, and with the sole purpose of seeking the truth.

At Turin in 1892, Canon Berta published his "*Dei cinque libri mosaici*," wherein he defended the views similar to those of Lenormant.

The Barnabite Semeria (*Revue Biblique* 1893, p. 434) went further, and declared that it would be a most useful thing for the Church if some one of sufficient ability would separate the inspired portions from the uninspired portions of Holy Writ.

The same views were advocated by the Barnabite Paolo Savi in the "*Science Catholique*," 1892—93. Canon Jules Didiot, professor at Lille in "*La logique surnaturelle subjective*," 1891, rejected the absolute infallibility of the Scriptures, but after the appearance of the Bull "*Providentissimus Deus*" he retracted his opinions in favor of the more conservative opinion in his, "*Traité de la Sainte Ecriture d'après S.S. Léon, XIII., (Paris, 1894).*"

In the year 1893 a little before the appearance of the Bull of Leo XIII. Msgr. D'Hulst, Rector of the free theological faculty of Paris, published in the "Correspondant" an article entitled "La Question biblique." In this article d'Hulst takes up the defense of Lenormant on the ground that the placing of a work on the Index is not of necessity a condemnation of its doctrine. After enumerating some of the reasons which may move the Congregation to prohibit a book, he declares that the ideas of Lenormant may have been prohibited for the reason that the world was not ready for them. He declares that "The hypothesis by which inspiration is extended to the things narrated of the origin of the human race, in such wise that the inspiration confers not infallibility on these narrations, but only joins doctrinal and moral truth to them, is adopted by a certain number of learned and orthodox men. . . . Such men admit that there may be in the Bible propositions not strictly true. God is not responsible for these, although he is the Inspirer of the whole work. The reason is that to reveal is one thing; to inspire, another. Revelation is divine teaching which must be true. Inspiration is an impulse which determines the sacred writer to write, directs him, moves him, watches over him. In the hypothesis which I am explaining this moving (*motio*) renders him immune from error in faith and morals; they believe that this preservation does not go further; they believe that it has the same limits as has the infallibility of the Church. The promise of inerrancy was made to the Church for the sole end that it might with certitude promulgate the rule of faith and morals. It is true that the Scriptures are not alone infallible, but also inspired. Yet although inspiration extends to everything, perhaps it confers not infallibility on all the statements of the inspired writer; perhaps this privilege is restricted to the things of faith and morals. Perhaps the other statements which are not by inspiration rendered infallible, are only employed as the vehicle of the teaching concerning faith and morals. It may be that God, the Inspirer, who could have corrected the material errors of the sacred writer judged it not useful to do this. These are the opinions of the liberal school (*école large*).

"The adherents of this school assert: First, that the best way to determine the effect of inspiration is to inquire into its motive. . . . But the end which God proposed in dictating the Holy Books is to teach man what he should believe, hope, and do, that he may bring him to his supernatural end. Therefore all the statements of Scripture which conduce to this end must be divine affirmations, but as to other things there seems to be doubt.

"Secondly, the Council of Trent declared the Vulgate authentic, but only in things of faith and morals. Therefore if the divine authority of the Vulgate is not defined except as regards the things of faith, the authority of the Holy Scripture is practically restricted within the same limits. Why should it not be theoretically?

"Moreover, the Vatican Council renewing the decree of the Council of Trent declares the true sense of Scripture to be that which holy Church holds. . . . But it adds that the interpretation of which it speaks, and to which the rules apply, is the interpretation in things of faith and morals."

Speaking of Cardinal Newman d'Hulst says: "Cardinal Newman restricts the liberty afforded by this theory to the *obiter dicta*. This timidity may readily be understood if we reflect that the eminent author located the question in a very dangerous point; for he treats of the object or extent of inspiration. Now if inspiration is of limited extent, there are uninspired portions of Holy Scripture. This is a new and dangerous formula, which it is difficult to bring into accord with the decrees of councils and the teaching of tradition. Hence it is evident why the prudent theologian restricted the application to fragments merely accessory. This difficulty is greatly lessened, and almost vanishes if we hold the total inspiration of Scripture, but in such a sense that in certain things not pertaining to faith the infallibility be restricted, which, however is the proper effect of inspiration. To exempt from infallible inspiration *obiter dicta* would be of little use to solve the great exegetical difficulties. . . . Wherefore other writers diligently considering not the extent of inspiration, but the effect of inspiration, apply the principle in a wide range not to merely accessory things, but

to considerable portions of Scripture; in the first place to the portions which treat of, or seem to treat of scientific questions, then to other texts of greater moment and extent which have, or seem to have, a historical character."

Msgr. d'Hulst affirms the sound doctrine concerning the relation of the Scriptures to the natural sciences: "The Scriptures do not convey scientific instruction, and therefore there can be no conflict. The Scriptures speak of these matters in accordance with the opinions then in vogue; such matters are not written for their own sake, but for a setting of religious ideas."

And now Msgr. d'Hulst comes to the most difficult question of all; the question which Père Lagrange has worked into his famous *Méthode Historique*; the question which divides the greatest minds in the Catholic Church, namely: May we apply to the portions of Scripture which are historical the same theory which without detriment to the faith we apply to the scientific statements of the Bible? Msgr. d'Hulst declares this to be the axis about which all future Biblical questions will revolve. Indeed were it not for it there would not be a *biblical question*. The doctrinal and moral parts of the Bible give us no difficulty. All the world accepts the principles enunciated above concerning the matters of natural science in the Bible; but the history in the Bible is the source of the greatest difficulties.

With admirable acumen, Msgr. d'Hulst declares that if the question were to be submitted whether the historical parts of the Bible should be treated in the same manner as the scientific parts a negative answer must be given. "For although we may deny that cosmology is taught in the Bible no man may in any way imagine that history is not taught. . . . At least a part of history is divinely taught, for revelation itself is a dogmatic fact, and the whole series of human events is bound up with revelation. The creation, the primitive state of man, the fall, the promise of a Saviour, the various divine covenants and the signs attesting them, the events which prepared the way for the Messiah, the life itself of the Saviour, his preaching, his death, his resurrection, the foundation of the Church, these are historical facts.

If these are false all religion is false. If they are not inspired nothing is inspired. If the inspired writers who deliver them are not by inspiration preserved immune from error, inspiration is of no avail. Therefore the question is not whether there is history in the Bible, but whether all the historical facts which are found in this divine collection are revealed, or at least attested by inspiration."

It seems to us that the principles here enunciated prove the historical method of Lagrange to be impossible. And yet Lagrange himself admits these principles. Thus we read in the opening paragraphs of Lecture VI. in the "Méthode Historique:"

"When, in the previous Lecture on the authority of the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, I applied to history the same principles as to science, the thought must have occurred to you, that for every point of similarity there might be between science and history, viewed as matter for biblical criticism, there were many more points of difference. Every kind of knowledge has its own rules and methods. In the first place, granted that we may hold that there is no science in the Bible, it would be more than paradoxical to maintain that the Bible contained no history, seeing that the Bible is the history of salvation. Science, moreover, based as it is upon experiment and calculation, is naturally outside the sphere of the greater number of men as soon as it goes beyond the mere observation of natural phenomena, while history, in itself, is nothing but the record of the doings of men as established by testimony. If in late years it has seemed to move in a somewhat mysterious region, it is simply because of the attention given to the study of sources which calls for specialized knowledge and a critically trained mind; but, in itself, history is but the record of what eye-witnesses have seen. So that while scientific theories like our own could not possibly have found a place in the Bible without an absolutely unnecessary revelation, and without doing violence to men's minds, on the other hand, no supernatural help was needed to write sound history.

"Hence there is no science in the Bible, although throughout, an elementary knowledge of arithmetic is supposed, for

that is well within the range of man; there are no metaphysics in the Bible, although the normal use of the intellect is always assumed; there is much history in the Bible, because the writing of history is familiar to all people who have reached the same stage as the Israelites. Now, if God did not reveal to His chosen people any scientific or metaphysical proposition, at that time beyond the range of their mind, because it was not profitable for their salvation, we have good ground for holding that neither did He reveal to them any history that was beyond the range of what could be seen or known except in so far as it was necessary for salvation. Hence, and this is a further difference, we have no hesitation in placing history, that is to say, the record of men's deeds, in a different category from the sciences and from metaphysics, because a man's salvation is inseparably connected with his actions. Thus it is quite possible that God may have made a revelation of history, and hence it is, that I wish to exclude from the conclusions which follow, all that concerns the Fall of man."

It is evident to all that there is an illogical sentence in this statement. After declaring that history is not in the category of science, Lagrange by inference places it in the same category by declaring: "Now if God did not reveal to his chosen people any scientific or metaphysical proposition, at that time beyond the range of their mind, because it was not profitable for their salvation, we have good ground for holding that neither did he reveal to them any history that was beyond the range of what could be seen or known, except in so far as it was necessary for salvation."

The exact opposite should be the logical influence: from the fact that history enters more intimately into the very essence of revelation, God might well be supposed to safeguard it more especially, lest an error in one statement might cast doubt on others more essential.

Msgr. d'Hulst rightly affirms that it is indifferent whether we consider certain books such as Ruth, Job and others to be historical, or doctrinal and moral treatises presented under the form of history. The thing is uncertain and in no wise pertains to faith. "A more difficult question is presented by

the first eleven chapters of Genesis. Certainly they should be held as historical were it not that grave reasons persuade us that we have to deal here with a mythological tradition of the most ancient oriental people, as F. Lenormant shows. His theories indeed seem new and bold in the Church. That they are new is not strange, since the documents of which he treats were only lately found; but they are not more bold than, for instance, the theory of St. Augustine concerning the six days of creation. But they say: 'Errors are introduced into the Scripture. Error excludes inspiration.' We answer: This is rashly said. Error excludes inspiration as far as it is imputed to God, not in as far as it is committed by the sacred writer. God could make himself sponsor of all that goes into the Scriptures; but also God could have limited inspiring action to these effects: to move the writer to write; to reveal to him certain truths; to direct him, and preserve him from all error in things of faith and morals; and yet, when the writer employs documents, not enter to correct their imperfections and less accurate statements, except where they were contrary to the doctrinal and moral end of inspiration. . . . There has always been admitted the human element subordinate to the divine element in the composition of the sacred books. All the commentators and all the Fathers of the Church have pointed out the differences of style, of genius, and of intellectual equipment of the different sacred writers. If the Holy Ghost could permit such defects, why not defects, in historical narratives which pertain not to faith? If the infallibility which is founded on inspiration be restricted to religious truths, there will be removed the gravest difficulties which are moved against the Scriptures."

With true Catholic spirit Msgr. d'Hulst proclaimed that he submitted his opinions to the infallible authority of the Church, whose voice he was ready to obey. After the condemnation of Lenormant's book many other treatises had been published which advocated analogous views. Rome had kept silent; and Msgr. d'Hulst interpreted this silence as a liberty to speak his views, always in subjection to the Church.

The silence of which this writer spoke was soon broken. In the same year Pope Leo XIII. published his Bull, "Providentissimus Deus," in which the principles of Msgr. d'Hulst are tacitly condemned.

True to his profession Msgr. d'Hulst and his associate faculty signified their obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff. They begin their letter thus; "The Rector and professors of the canonical theological Faculty of the University of Paris, after carefully reading and meditating on the encyclical letter 'Prov. Deus,' declare themselves prepared with a willing mind to accept and obey all that Your Holiness therein teaches, commands, and advises, especially concerning the effect of inspiration which extends itself to all the parts of all the canonical books so that it excludes all error."

Against Msgr. d'Hulst's article Jaugey wrote in "La Science Catholique," 1892-93, and Brucker in the "Etudes," 1893. Jacquier, recognizing that the historical difficulties had brought about the new concept of inspiration, suggested that the adherents of the "new exegesis" should collect all the scientific, chronological, and historical difficulties. The conservative theologians should then attempt their solution; and perhaps thus concessions might be made on both sides, and the points of difference lessened. This is the wisest advice, but it is a great undertaking, and still awaits men capable of accomplishing it.

In a letter to the Archbishops, Bishops and Clergy of France under date of Sept. 8, 1899, Pope Leo XIII. reiterated with great earnestness his condemnation of the liberal theories of inspiration: "Venerable Brethren, regarding the study of the Holy Scriptures we again call your attention to the instructions which we have given in our encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" which we desire that professors should make known to their pupils, and add the necessary explanations. Let them warn (their pupils) against the alarming tendencies which seek to thrust themselves into the interpretation of the Bible, and which if they prevail will soon ruin inspiration and the supernatural order. Under the specious pretext of removing from the adver-

saries of revelation arguments which seems irrefutable against the authenticity and veracity of the Holy Books certain Catholic writers have thought well to accept their arguments on their side. Pursuant to these strange and dangerous tactics they have labored with their own hands to make breaches in the walls of the city which they have a mission to defend. In our aforesaid encyclical and in another document (Letter to The General of the Friars Minor) we have justly dealt with the dangerous temerities. While encouraging our exegetes to keep abreast of progress and criticism, we have firmly maintained the principles sanctioned by the traditional authority of Fathers and Councils and renewed in our days by the Council of the Vatican."

It is clear to all that the Supreme Pontiff in these utterances has in mind the theories taught by Lenormant, Loisy, and Lagrange, and thought possible by Msgr. d'Hulst.

In the *Revue Biblique* of 1896-97 Père Lagrange published a series of articles entitled "The Inspiration of the Holy Books." His theory is spread out over a great mass of words, and often obscurely enunciated, but we may gather from it the following principles. "God teaches all that is taught in the Bible; but he teaches nothing except what is taught by the inspired writer, and the inspired writer teaches nothing except what he intends (by his writing) to teach." Lagrange calls this a very simple theory, declaring that thus inspiration does not change the sense of terms, nor the character of propositions, nor the species of literature to which the books belong. It is only by studying these that we may come at the idea and intention of the author. The illustrations given to prove this principle seem to us puerile and illogical. Lagrange cites the sentence from the Psalms: "There is no God," as an evidence of a statement which the author did not wish to teach, and as therefore a proof that the author teaches only what he wishes to teach. Issues are confused here. No man believes that every sentence in the Bible, without regard to whose utterance it be, or its context, is true. In such absurd supposition Christ would be a malefactor, a blasphemer, and God the Father would give

place to Baal. But there is no logical connection between these simple self-evident facts and a system that is propounded in order to allow its author later to say that the primitive history of the Bible is closely allied to myths. Thus he continues:

"On the other hand, no one will deny that not all that appears to be historical is really historical; and so I need not insist upon the now generally accepted and perfectly simple theory—so simple indeed that I can hardly claim as my own the words which express it—to the effect that the value of statements seemingly affirmative or negative depends entirely upon the style of literary production in which such apparently categorical statements appear. The first thing to be done is to determine the various literary styles found in the Bible and presenting the appearance of history. Catholic sentiment rightly shrinks from the use of the word 'myth,' but between myth and history there lies a very wide field. Let us examine, then, the different forms of literary production known to the ancients, so as to find out how many of them the Bible contains, in order to be able to estimate the true character of the expression used.

"Can it be said that there are myths in the Bible? The very idea jars on the ordinary mind, and it will not allow the word to be uttered. A few Catholic writers, daily growing more numerous, prefer to draw a distinction.

"Naturally they are not anxious to retain the word if it gives pain. But they find its use convenient to express the likeness—at least the external likeness—there is between myths and primitive history; only, they carefully add that the mythological elements found in the Bible have been carefully 'stripped of any polytheistic tinge, and are only used to express lofty religious ideas.' The phrase is that of Dom Hildebrand Höpfl, a Benedictine, used in a pamphlet directed against the rationalistic methods of the higher critics.*

"No one, as far as I know, has attempted to analyze this statement or any equivalent one, so that the popular mind,

* Höpfl, *Die hoehere Bibelkritik*, Paderborn, 1902, p. 63. Cf. *Revue Biblique*, 1902, p. 603.

is uneasy and not favorably disposed. Speaking for myself, I think it would be well definitely to put the word aside, on the ground that words—which in themselves are of little importance—should only be used in the sense assigned to them by general use. We are accustomed to associate the word 'myth' with the idea of a false or even childish religion. Let us leave the word alone, and try and reach the root of the matter.

"We may take as an example the story of Lot's wife, changed into a pillar of salt, in circumstances with which you are familiar. The passage is quite definite: 'and his wife looking behind her, was turned into a pillar of salt.' (Gen. XIX. 26) To understand its full meaning you should have seen the locality. To the south of the Dead Sea, on the western side, there lies a long hill, resembling a whale cast ashore. It is an inexhaustible salt mine, and supplies all the homes of Jerusalem. On the side of the sea, by erosion or by some other geological phenomena, blocks have been formed which look like statues. There has always been at least one for the tradition, which now no longer speaks of the wife of Lot, but of *bint Lout*—the daughter of Lot. Now, ask those who are interested in folklore or mythology—ask yourselves, ask your own common-sense and your conscience. There can be no doubt what the answer will be. Were we to find this phrase elsewhere than in the Bible, we should simply say that popular imagination had personified a thing, and having found in some block of salt a human likeness, connected it with the memory of a woman who disappeared in some great catastrophe. To be changed into stone is generally a punishment, as in the case of Niobe." (*Méthode Historique*, VI.)

The falsity of Lagrange's principle must be evident to all. We may concede that God is responsible for all that is taught in the Bible, without committing God to a solid firmament, a geocentric system, etc.; for these things are not taught in the Bible. The language of a people was accepted to express truth without affirming or denying their ideas on scientific phenomena. But when Lagrange affirms that the inspired writer teaches nothing except what he wishes

to teach, the statement is evidently false. Many prophets uttered prophecies which were sealed for ages after they wrote. In many cases the inspired writers did not comprehend the full sense of what they wrote. The typical sense of Holy Scripture is a legitimate sense, and yet the human writers did not know it. Will any man say that Moses knew that the brazen serpent in the desert was a type of the Crucified Saviour?

Lagrange next declares that scientific criticism was satisfied the moment the principle was conceded that the Scriptures spoke according to appearances. He then asks: "May we apply the same principle to the historical books?" All his subsequent argument, all his illustrations are in defense of an affirmative answer to this question. As we have before stated, he makes some restrictions of his theory. There are some strictly revealed historical facts, as for instance the fall of man. Thus he declares in his VI. Lecture of the *Méthode Historique*:

- "But it is quite evident that the first chapters of the Bible are not a history of mankind, nor even of one of its branches, for the simple reason that we could with difficulty find one fact for every thousand years, and even then we should not know where to place it.

"You may object that you are anxious to retain those first chapters as so many landmarks in the history of the continuity of religion. Very good; but we must bear in mind that that is what they are, for their only importance is that of fingerposts along this wide waste. But let us take care to recognize their true character. You will agree with me when I say that among those persons there are perhaps some names of peoples: if I go so far as to suggest names of towns, you will recall Sidon to mind. That being so, why not allow that among these fragments there are also names which merely stand for an impersonal progress of mankind, lost memories, the source of which no one knows, occupying in history the same relative position as the ether with which we fill space, without fully realizing what it does, simply because we must put something between the starry spheres?

"The very fact that nothing so restrained is found anywhere else, that mythology proper is excluded, itself suffices to guard from error anyone who seeks to see things as they really are. These characteristics, taken by themselves, would suffice to show forth the influence of monotheism, and that all is in keeping with the dignity of the dogma of inspiration.

"When I began, I said that I placed the history of Original Sin on one side. Not that I desire to affirm the historicity of all the details of the account; on that subject I have elsewhere clearly expressed my mind.* But some might perhaps be tempted to conclude, from the ideas I have been developing, that the essential fact itself cannot have been handed down by tradition. I do not think that follows from the premises. I have endeavored to draw a distinction between the details and the *core* of stories which may be handed down most faithfully for centuries in the most varied surroundings, everywhere undergoing some transformation because it is everywhere tinged with borrowed colors, yet remaining everywhere recognizable.

"The study of religious histories, and particularly of primitive histories, has familiarized folklorists with this fact. There seems to me, therefore, no impossibility whatever in the transmission of the account of the Fall from generation to generation for thousands of years.

"But even supposing such transmission to be impossible, *dato, non concesso*, we have only to see whether Original Sin, which evades any strict historical proof, is or is not part of the divine revelation. It is quite certain that it is included in revelation. The conclusion therefore is that it has been revealed. And its revelation seems quite what might be expected, considering its capital importance, and its necessary connection with Redemption. If the dogma involves as a necessary consequence the unity of the human race, our reasoning will be the same. And really I fail to see that in this matter we are all awkwardly placed. History is silent; so there can be no objection from that quarter.

* *Revue Biblique*, 1897, p. 341 seq.

Natural science brings against it the difference of races. It was perhaps somewhat of a difficulty, and is perhaps a difficulty even now, for those who maintain the immutability of species. But if moderate evolution tends to predominate science, I should be much surprised if it were not able to explain this phenomenon by its own principles.

"On account of the Church's definition, I believe in Original Sin according to the Church's meaning; but abstracting from this dogmatic point, based upon the unshakable foundation of revelation, there can be no objection to assigning primitive history its true character, even though it may not have been sufficiently understood by the men of bygone days."

Lagrange divides historical books into three classes: The romance, history proper, and primitive history. The romance is a creation of the imagination, and may be the means of inculcating truth or falsehood. Strict history has a certain fallible latitude in details without ceasing to be true. Primitive history holds a middle place between romance and real history: "No ancient people has solved the mystery of its origin. There are certain annals which are the foundation of history, and there are legends. In the latter case if a historian reproduces the narrations current in his day, to preserve them to future generations, he gives them for what they are worth. Everyone is familiar with this kind of history. For example, it is well known that to indicate the origin of different peoples men derive them from an eponymic hero. The Dorians have as ancestor Dorus; the Phoenicians, Phoenix. The method deceives no one, there is therein no properly called affirmation. Men have only wished to reduce the confused questions of origins to a certain order."

Lagrange believes that an imaginative historical narrative, provided it teach a true lesson, may have place in the Scripture. He cites the Book of Tobias. Whatever we may say of the example chosen, certain it is that the principle is applicable. Even though we hold that Job is a historical personage, no one will deny that the substance of the book is the creation of an inspired imagination to inculcate a great moral lesson.

Of course the chief place in the historical books of the Bible is held by history properly so called. But even here Lagrange declares that the inspired writers did not affirm the precision of facts and words "*avec la dernière acribie.*" Absolute exactness in all details is not in the nature of history; the inspired writers reproduced the substantial truths of words and facts.

This part of Lagrange's theory pleases every right-minded scholar. Certain modal differences in the Evangelists are well explained by this theory. But *venenum in cauda*.

Lagrange comes to the third application with a certain timid hesitation: "But the history of origins, this strange history where the narration of facts and the uncertain legend jostle each other (*se coudoient*) in close contact, if (such history) enters into the Bible, how shall we recognize it there? How discern the true from the false? The imaginative narration and the parable teach no fact; real history teaches all facts; but (in primitive history) where lies the truth? How may we arrive at certitude? And most of all in this mixture what becomes of the divine illumination? the infallible judgment, *judicium infallibile de acceptis*?

"Indeed it is a most delicate question, but we can not draw back. A difficulty encompasses us on all sides. Let us endeavor to solve it after having implored light.

"In the first place I ask: In what consists this infallible judgment when there is question of a work of the imagination or a parable? The facts related have no objective reality; they have no purpose except to present a lesson; to present a truth under the convenient form, as the parable of Lazarus, or the Cantic of Canticles. The same holds in our hypothesis; (primitive history) aims to present a truth, nothing but a truth in the most apt manner, whether it be a simple affirmation or the adapting of an ancient legend to national forms. But how shall we discern? Is it proven that we must effect this discernment so quickly and easily? Is the Scripture so clear as some protestants pretend? On the contrary is it not of faith that it is obscure? We know that a parable declares the existence of no object-

ive entity. Do we always know when we are dealing with a parable? Some speak of the parable of Lazarus; others believe it to be real history. . . . The same is true of Tobias, Judith, Jonas. If therefore God leaves us uncertain whether Judith be true history, why could he not leave us in the same incertitude when there is question of distinguishing the various elements which compose a book? Who shall decide the question? The Church as a final resort; exegetes in the first attempt, as humble servants of the Church."

After attempting to find proof for his system in the fact that Fathers and theologians have admitted allegories and metaphors in the first chapter of Genesis, Lagrange continues: "Having established these preliminaries we definitively ask: Is primitive history found in the Bible with the same literary characteristics as among other peoples, save only that it is the medium of an infallible teaching?" It is equivalent to say: Is the history of Noah and his sons to be placed on the same plane as the legend of Romulus and Remus?

Lagrange answers his question: "Here is our conclusion: There exists in the Bible a primitive history, the basis of which is guaranteed by divine truth; but certain circumstances may be considered either as metaphors and allegories; or a Hebrew accommodation of the oral tradition. These circumstances are more the clothing of the truth than the truths contemplated in the teaching, and in interpreting one may occupy himself less with their material object than with their relation to the principal truth taught. But when the sacred writer employs documents or uncertain oral traditions he has the guidance of the infallible judgment. The judgment preserves him from all formal error in his statements, and assures the fitness of what may be called national or popular metaphors to render correctly his proper teaching. I distinguish between the foundation and certain circumstances which have place in all primitive history; and I say that the foundation of primitive biblical history is always true. But if even the foundation of the primitive history of other peoples may be false, why make an exception in favor of the Bible? It is simply on account of

the divine truth, because the Bible is inspired. . . . It is most reasonable to ascribe such action to God, and to hold that he teaches us a true history, whatever be the means chosen by him to deliver it to us. He could have taught us all the circumstances with the same certitude, and we are disposed always to believe them true, except when an examination of the text shows us that the writer did not intend them as true history. . . . For example, if it be proven, as M. Oppert alleges, on whom I leave the responsibility, that the ages of the patriarchs are artificial reductions of Chaldean epochs, it is evident that the man who made this mathematical operation has not pretended to write history, and does not give us as history the result of his calculations. He has only wished to supply the defect of positive chronology. Our rule shall be to accept as true all that the author delivers as such, substance and circumstances. We shall always consider the foundation to be true history; and we shall never cast doubt on the circumstances except when we are persuaded thereto by what we believe to have been the intention of the author." *Revue Biblique* 1896 pp. 510 et seqq.

Lagrange has made many applications of his theory:

"Berosus tells how the fish-god Oannes, by a series of apparitions, led men on to civilization; then he enumerates kings with very long and empty reigns. The Bible is more serious, is closer to truth, and, I venture to say, closer to history. On going back in thought to the beginnings of the race, the historical deeds of individuals entirely escape us, though we do possess the elements at least of the history of civilization; in other words, the progress it has made, and the great discoveries which have led it on to the point reached. When the Bible tells us that the arts developed little by little, that nomadic life gradually assumed its own general characteristics, different from those of town life, that men did not always play the kinnor and flute, nor work brass and iron. . . . I suppose anthropology recognizes it to be quite correct, and that it is impossible otherwise to conceive the beginning and progress of civilization.

"But can that be said to constitute history, duly noted and handed down? I do not think so, the reason being that history, or rather what we mean by real history, demands some knowledge of the circumstances, or at least of the time and place. The Bible, of course, cites proper names. But, as I pointed out at the beginning, that is not enough, because those proper names are given in a Hebrew form which is not their own; and besides, what is the value of a proper name, of which the form has undergone change, in the midst of such a vast expanse of time? And if the syllables do not correspond to syllables, nor yet, doubtless, the sense to the original sense, what is there left of the historical setting of the fact? Can anyone see therein an historical reality which involves the truthfulness of the sacred writer? To what extent is it of faith that Jobal invented music?

"And yet, those proper names are a most interesting study. They often seem to me to be the very name of the object invented, thus perhaps witnessing to a marked degree the admirable wisdom of the biblical writer. Could anything, in fact, be more restrained, prudent, and sound than the statement that this or that art, known in our own day, had a beginning, that music was invented by a musician? It is a great virtue to be able to say nothing when you know nothing. It called for much more than that, to put an obstacle in the way of the Greeks; though they, too, were well acquainted with this elementary method.

"Let me give you some examples found in Pliny.* Kloster invented the distaff (*κλωστήρ*, distaff); Staphylos (*σταφυλή* bunch of grapes) mingled water and wine. The oar was discovered in two places—the handle at Kopae (*κώπη* handle) and the blade at Plataea (*πλατή* flat). Or it may even take the form of a genealogy: thus, according to Philo of Byblos, fire is descended from three brothers named Light, Fire, and Flame. It is all true enough, and deceives no one. Turn to the first story we have in the Bible. I pass over the name of Abel, which probably means shep-

* *Hist. Nat.*, vii. 57 Cf. *Etudes sur les religions sémitiques*.

herd. The first town is called Henoah, derived from a word meaning dedication. All have heard of the trumpet of Jubilee, *jobel*: *jobel* in Phœnician means ram: the connection between the two is very natural; the ram's horn was used as a musical instrument. Can we wonder that Jabal was the father of shepherds, and Jobal the father of musicians? The name Cain means blacksmith in Arabic; and it was Tubal-Cain who was the first maker of musical instruments. I do not seek to lower the Bible by making this analysis; on the contrary, I think it works out to its honour.

"It was quite out of the question to write real history, and yet it was of importance to show by a continuous chain of evidence the unity of the history of salvation. The Bible avoids absurd or obscene accounts; there is no pretence of ignoring sin, but sin receives its due punishment, and is not glorified, as though it changed its character by becoming the privilege of heroes. The Bible avoids even unfounded stories. It is taken up with tangible things, with discoveries which are still known; it relates their origin and progress, and leaves them in a hazy light, which has no outward semblance of actual history. If the personality of Lamech seems to stand out against this background it is only in an elegy. Could the author have told us more clearly that there exists no history of these periods?

"I find a similar regard for reality, in so far as it can be reached and set forth, in the story of the Deluge and the Tower of Babel.

"There is a modern school, represented by Canon Cheyne, which considers the Deluge mythical— mythical, that is, in that it is the translation of an astronomical phenomenon into history. But the great majority of anthropologists consider that the Deluge, of which accounts are everywhere found, is the memory, more or less modified, of real floods.* M. Suess, professor of geology at Vienna, and M. Raymond de Girard, professor of geology at Freiburg, have even considered they could indicate the physical causes of the Baby-

* M. Loisy does not seem to have definitely made up his mind about these two systems, nor does he point out in his work on Babylonian myths how fundamentally different they are.

lonian deluge.† Be that as it may, the general character of the biblical story points to a real flood, the religious interpretation of which has far surpassed its historical importance. Nor is the Tower of Babel a mere product of the imagination. The biblical writer had certainly seen the gigantic unfinished temple of Borsippa, which Nabuchodonosor finding in ruins in consequence of the bad state of its gutters, made a boast of achieving. It was no mere flight of the imagination to look upon Babylon as a proud city where all languages were to be heard. And after M. Blanckenkorn's careful investigation, the results of which were accepted as satisfactory by M. de Lapparent, we are entitled to hold that the sinking of the south part of the Dead Sea may have taken place at a time when there were men on the earth, and that the account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah cannot be simply set aside as purely mythical—as the picturesque expression of the horror inspired by scenery unique in the world for its sublime desolateness. Undoubtedly the biblical story goes far beyond the mere fact, otherwise it would not faithfully express what it wishes to express; but it is always careful to have as the background of its picture some striking reality which fills the horizon, whether it be in the depths of the desert or of the past." (*Méthode Historique*, VI.)

Withal Père Lagrange believes in an unrestricted inspiration extending even to the words. In his third conference before the Catholic Institute of Toulouse, which conferences were afterward published under the name of "*La Méthode Historique*," he speaks of inspiration thus: "We must have recourse to the principles of faith and to psychology if we would understand what the grace of inspiration really is, what special light it communicates to the intellect, and how the will is moved. From the Church's definitions we may conclude that God's help is antecedent and not consequent, that it is an impulse, and so necessarily a light bestowed upon him, for man is no mere machine, and his will does not determine anything without a corresponding light in the intellect. Now since this help is antecedent to the whole

† Cf. M. de Girard's article in the *Revue Thomiste*.

operation, it must extend to the whole work, and consequently even to the very words; but since the sacred writer used his ordinary faculties, it impressed nothing ready-made upon the mind—not even the thoughts. On this particular point I have nothing new to say, and nothing clearer to propound.

“So far reason has been working within its proper limits; it is but fitting, however, that it should show more reserve in dealing with the divine historical fact. Our guiding principle in this matter must be clear to all. It is no business of ours to decide what God must have done, or what it was fitting that He should have done; all we have to do is humbly to note whatever forms part of His work. Such questions are not to be solved by each man according to his taste; we must be content to be guided by facts.

“The demands of reason are to be taken into account as long as the question merely concerns what God may or may not inspire, and to whom it is fitting that He should betake Himself to do so. We may never affirm that God could teach error—that would be blasphemous—but we ought to be very careful about confidently concluding that a thing is fitting or unfitting. Let casuists, by all means, use probable reasons, in obscure cases, but, as straightforward critics, we will confine our attention to facts. What we want more especially is that vigorous care in reasoning characteristic of true theologians: the opinion of such men is far less to be feared than the routine of those who make theology a mere matter of professional knowledge, who are unable to bring the light of reason to bear upon what they dislike, except through prejudices begotten of the necessarily narrow outlook they allow themselves.

“If a French priest were to celebrate Holy Mass with covered head, he would be guilty of an act of grave irreverence, which could only be paralleled by celebrating in China with head uncovered. We have not the same ideas as had the ancients concerning history, morality, literary property, use of pseudonyms, borrowing—in more or less disguised form—from other books, the revision and re-editing of works. Your respect for inspired authors may make you wonder

whether you are to attribute to them what to you seems improper. Do you not see that you are condemning the actions of the missionary in China?

"But we must subject the historical idea of inspiration to a more searching analysis, and as we have dealt with the person inspired, let us now turn to the aim of inspiration. If we only knew the exact relation in which inspiration stood to divine teaching a great result would be achieved. No one hesitates to say that inspiration goes far beyond the limits of religious teaching, since it extends to everything, even to the words themselves, while religious teaching is not everywhere found. It would be a mistaken application of St. Augustine's principle that God does not teach in the Bible what is not of use for salvation, to suppose that God ceases to inspire when not actually teaching a religious truth.

"The consequence would be that all that is non-religious in the Bible would not be inspired. Now it is difficult to see, for instance, where lies the religious teaching of the Book of Ruth. In controversy with protestants it has often been maintained that all dogma is not contained in Scripture, for the simple reason that the sacred writers had no intention of always teaching it; they wrote as particular circumstances demanded, sometimes to teach, but also to encourage, console, or recommend, as in the letter to Philemon; and we may add that throughout the whole Psalter, rich as it is in the loftiest religious truths, it is never the Psalmist's direct object to inculcate religious truths, since he addresses himself to God, whom he has no intention of instructing when he confesses his iniquities and asks for assistance from Him. Still less does the Psalmist teach God historical or natural truths. So that one may quite fairly ask whether the aim of inspiration really *is* instruction. That it is not its direct aim seems clearly to follow from the distinction between revelation and inspiration. The Bible contains God's teaching: the religious truths He taught were communicated by revelation, and it is not essential that revelation should coincide in point of time with inspiration. On the other hand, if, in that teaching, we take the facts not directly bearing upon our salvation, we may say that generally speaking, in their natural and

historical aspect, there was no absolute need of God's teaching them, since man's memory would have sufficed to retain them.

"Inspiration leads to writing; and the aim of writing is to fix and record previously-acquired knowledge, so that the grace of inspiration has as its primary object not to teach, but to preserve the memory of revealed truths, and of the historical facts which enable the order and sequence of revelation to be understood, and that, although the aim of the sacred writer himself be to teach: the notion of inspiration is wider in range.

"It follows from this first point, that the doctrine contained in an inspired book is not necessarily perfect in its literal and historical meaning. God, in wishing to preserve the memory of facts of importance in the history of man's salvation—occasionally merely of secondary importance, as in the case of the Book of Ruth—determined, perhaps, to preserve the memory of the imperfect ideas men had of the Godhead at a given stage of revelation. You remember we admitted the idea of essential progress in the Old Testament. He does not teach those imperfect ideas to us in the form in which they are expressed, nor does He desire that we should confine ourselves to them. Were we to do so, we should be making a mistake, for through His Son we have a higher knowledge of His infinite perfection; it was His wish that we should have knowledge of those ideas, the better to appreciate the need in which we stand of His light and grace. And so it is quite possible that we may find in the Bible inferior sentiments expressed, not only by the impious, but even by such as lived in the hope of a clearer light; thus the tone of the Books of Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus is no doubt practical enough, yet often wanting in moral elevation, and lacking that exquisite delicacy which constitutes the glory of Christian virtue. The meaning has to be spiritualized in order to raise it to the Christian standard, and through its spiritual meaning the Holy Scriptures regain in our eyes their full value. And hence the Church, full of reverence as she is for the Word of God, obliges no one to read it, and all instinct-

ively feel that they derive more profit for their souls from one chapter of the *Imitation* than from the whole Book of Leviticus.

"If we consider the Spirit of God which inspired it, the Bible is the noblest of books; but its aim and object is not so lofty. God inspired the preservation of this teaching, but it is far inferior to the teaching we find throughout the Church. They are *egena elementa*, the words spoken to them of old: for us our Lord reserved more saving words. The facts speak for themselves.

"Yet we must not go too far. Let us remember what we said before—reason itself, as well as faith, will bar the way when it needs must be barred. It is impossible that God should teach error. It is therefore impossible, not that the Bible, recording the words of all kinds of men, should contain no error, but that an intelligent study of the Bible should lead us to conclude that God taught error.

"But what do the sacred writers teach? They teach, we are told, what they categorically affirm. Now it has long since been pointed out that the Bible is not a mere collection of theses or categorical affirmations. There are certain forms of literary composition in which no absolute statement is made as to the reality of the facts related: they are used merely as the groundwork of a moral lesson—of this the parable is an example. Now inspiration does not change the forms of composition: each must be interpreted according to its own particular rules. It is not necessary that I should insist on this point; it has been fully accepted in the *Etudes* by Père Prat, and to me it seems the very best means of meeting current objections to the truthfulness of the Bible. To-day, however, I wish to look at the question from another standpoint, and consider the method of divine teaching as shown by the Bible itself.

"As our starting-point we shall take the facts we have just noted.

"We all agree that everything God teaches must be received with reverence, but it is quite clear that in the Bible this teaching is not to be found in ready-made statements standing in a state of splendid isolation. It is mingled with

numberless stories, discussions, poetical effusions, anecdotes, prayers, and metaphors. We all willingly admit that the inspired writer has not always the intention of giving instruction in the name of God, as is quite clear, for instance, when he prays to God for pardon of his sins; though it is none the less true that few prayers of the Bible contain such valuable teaching as does the *Miserere*. And so it is possible that there may be divine teaching, even when the sacred writer seems to make no mention of it. On the other hand, we must not be in too great a hurry to receive as a statement made by God what the writer is merely relating, without taking the trouble to indicate it as his own. If religious teaching itself is frequently a resultant whose formula the Church alone is competent to state, with still greater force does this apply to those secondary elements which only figure in Scripture to clothe the truth, or, if you prefer St. Augustine's figure, to serve as the sounding-board of the lyre. All this goes to prove that God's teaching is infinitely beyond our own, even in the method of which He makes use, and that, consequently it is not to be judged by our standards.

"Some few years ago one of my brethren Père Lacôme, in a little book, entitled *Quelques considérations exégétiques sur le premier chapitre de la Genèse*, which was published with the fullest approval of Père Monsabre, drew the exact distinction that is here needed. His theory had not the success it would have to-day, because less attention was then paid to such problems. I shall take the liberty of quoting a few extracts: "This small nation (Israel) owed to its Prophets, and to them alone, its rise above all others. Thanks to them, their ideas were purified from errors concerning the Godhead.

But apart from and outside this one point, the Prophet had no call to rectify the ideas of his people, and he left them as they were: he took them as he found them, as inconsistent as are the ideas of a child, false figures of the true, radically incomplete ideas, as the ideas of men will ever be. Yet the Spirit of God gave himself full play in the maze of our illusions, without ever adopting, to the extent of identifying Himself therewith, an erroneous opinion; He

may be said to have leaned upon it, or better, to have glided over it, even as do the rays of sunshine over a faulty mirror, or a pool of muddy water, without thereby contracting any stain.'

"How are such faulty statements to be reconciled with the dignity of the Holy Ghost? After all, we are concerned with a book whose author is God, who can neither deceive nor be deceived. It is the standing difficulty. 'Even granting,' P. Lacôme proceeds, 'that the sky spoken of in Genesis is a solid vault, which in reality it is not: can the Holy Spirit be said to have fallen into error? Our own common-sense can give the answer. When a teacher wishes to teach a child science—astronomy, for example—he proceeds step by step, not being able to convey at once the whole of his knowledge to the mind of his pupil. Before he can go forward he must have a starting-point, and so the ideas already in the mind of the child will have to serve as the foundation of all his teaching. Those ideas are the only material to hand, the only forces wherewith to work to set the mind in motion and cause it to go forward.

"When a master has to enter into the mind of his pupil, he endeavors to discover the weird and foolish ideas it has; and when he has found them, he makes use of them to insinuate some particles of truth; and then to help him to digest the first lessons of astronomy, he goes back to the myths and gropings of old, he personifies the sun, speaks of its going forth on its daily course from its rise to its setting; but can it be fairly said that in so doing the master approved of all the illusions that fill that youthful mind? Now in the Bible the Holy Spirit is such a master, such a preacher.

"He is a teacher in the midst of the other teachers of this world; He teaches as they do, and in their own way; He has a teaching of His own knowledge, of His own supernatural knowledge, and He wishes to impart it to man. . . . 'Speaking of the Wisdom of God rejecting the knowledge of man, he says: 'With the sole qualification of Teacher of Divine Science she came, and established her chair by the side of other chairs, in the public places and cross-roads she gathered together all the passers-by without any distinction,

and to them set forth her teaching; she marked out her own definite position, and outside that position she spoke the language of the people, as all great teachers of the human race have done. And if to man, who is all his life but a little child, she spoke in childish terms, and spelled out to him the mysteries of Heaven, we really cannot blame her for our own stammering and inconsequence, she whose teaching is so justly pure and lofty. Our own ignorance alone should be blamed.'

"This theory, I said, created no sensation. Yet there was a watchman on the alert. Père Brucker, in the *Etudes*, denounced the views as dangerous, and concluded that, 'Pleasing as Père Lacôme's hypothesis may at first sight appear, it seems to me fraught with ruinous consequences. . . . No wise and conscientious human teacher would act in such a way; nor would he bolster himself up on the wrong ideas of his pupil even to begin his work, and run the risk of their being mistaken for truth, or of discrediting his own lessons in advance. Still less, therefore, could the divine master, Truth itself, make use of error, in any degree whatever, to open human intellects to His supernatural doctrine. He could only exploit (if I may be allowed the word) what is good and true in our ideas.'*

"The theory is perhaps painted in rather dark colors. Père Lacôme had said, to lean upon, or better, to *glide over*; Père Brucker interprets him to mean, 'to bolster himself up.'

"Père Lacôme was particularly careful to draw a distinction between two essentially different forms of teaching, where his critic would appear to see only one form. It would be foolish for a teacher of geometry to tolerate in his pupils wrong ideas about a straight line: how could he 'bolster himself up' with that? But need the teacher of grammar trouble himself about the truth of the examples cited to prove the rule, and when he is teaching them how to spell the name of King Pharamond, may he not pass lightly over the obscurity of the early history of France?

* *Etudes*, p. 504. 1895.

“Now if it be the case that St. Paul and our divine Saviour have argued from Holy Scripture according to the mental habits of the Jews, without seeking the exact text and without binding themselves down to its precise meaning, and that the Apostles set forth as the fulfilment of a prophecy what is merely an application based upon the similarity of the incidents, with how much more reason may they not have made use of current Jewish ideas in matters literary and scientific without seeking to rectify them? And if this course of action is not unworthy of the Author of our faith, why may we not presume that a similar course may have been adopted by other sacred writers in their exposition of divine teaching? The theological statement of the fact is not of recent origin: as is so frequently the case, the idea was stated by St. Augustine, St. Thomas moulded it, and, in his Encyclical, *Providentissimus Deus*, Leo XIII. has consecrated it anew. The rule is so excellent as to need no apology for its repetition.

“‘We have first to consider,’ says Leo XIII., ‘that the sacred writers, or, to speak more accurately, the Holy Ghost who spoke by them, did not intend to teach men these things (that is to say, the essential nature of the things of the visible universe), things in no way profitable to salvation.’* Hence they do not seek to penetrate the secrets of nature, but rather described and dealt with things in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time, and which in many instances are in daily use at this day, even by the most eminent men of science. Ordinary speech primarily and properly describes what comes under the senses; and somewhat in the same way the sacred writers—as the Angelic Doctor also reminds us—‘went by what sensibly appeared,’† or put down what God, speaking to men, signified, in the way men could understand and were accustomed to’ (*Providentissimus Deus*, § 28).

“Then after a section working out the same idea, the Pope concludes that, ‘The principles here laid down will apply to cognate sciences, and especially to history’ (§ 30).

* *Etudes*, p. 502. 1895. † ST AUGUSTINE, *De Genesi ad litt.*, 9. 20.

"F. Brucker accepts St. Thomas' formula, but takes it to mean that the Bible, 'in relating, for instance, the formation of the firmament, the standing still of the sun, etc., speaks according to outward *appearances*, and consequently speaks *truly*, though its language is not properly *scientific*.'*

"It would be more correct to say that in such cases the Bible is neither right nor wrong. It is quite clear that the ancient writers knew no more than they appear to know. When I use similar statements, I know, like everyone else, that it is wrong, so much so that the error has become a mere figure of speech. Now, can an author who looks upon the sky as a solid vault, and who definitely states his opinion in that sense (for otherwise we should never have guessed it), be really said to express himself in a manner at once exact and true, though not strictly scientific? Is it possible in such a case to make a distinction between science and truth?

"It may be objected that if the statement is not true it must be false, and then what becomes of the truthfulness of the Bible? The objection admits of a simple answer. A statement must be either true or false: but here, there is no question of a statement. Remember what St. Thomas says: the sacred writer 'went by what sensibly appeared.' If you confine yourself to mere appearances, you do not judge the thing in itself; and where there is no such judgment there is neither affirmation nor negation. Now it is an elementary logical fact that truth and error are only to be found in a formal act of judgment.

"The Holy Father very briefly states that the same criterion should be applied to history."

Lagrange cites the following passage from Cornely:

"The interpreter ought to pay great attention to the manner in which the sacred writers give their historical accounts. For, as St. Jerome points out, 'it is customary in Scripture for the historian to give the common opinion as generally received in his own day;' and again; 'many things are related in the Scriptures according to the opinion of the day in which the facts occurred, and not according to what in

* ST. THOMAS, *Summa Theol.*, p. 1. q. lxx., a 1. ad 3.

reality took place (*et non juxta quod rei veritas continebat*).¹ This observation of the holy doctor is most important. He thus warns us not to press the words of Scripture to make them meet the present state of scientific knowledge, but to explain them in accordance with the ideas and intentions of the sacred writer. What a number of difficulties would never have been raised had all interpreters always kept St. Jerome's word of warning before them?" Lagrange concludes:

"It means to say that historical accounts, and even those which bear the fullest token of their historical character, must not be understood in the light of the knowledge of God who knows all things, but in the light of man's limited outlook, and, that it is quite conceivable that God should not communicate further information to the sacred writer, who knows no more than other men on a particular point, even though, in consequence, he should make use of a materially wrong expression.

"Use all the arguments *ex convenientia* you like—these are facts, clear biblical facts, and easy to check. From this it follows that the sacred writers speak according to what appears to them. The theory is a traditional one. It has merely to be applied to particular cases as the needs of criticism call for it, making due allowance for the distinction between history and natural science. And it is precisely in that application of traditional principles to the results of human industry that consists the progress of theological science," (*Méthode Historique*, pp. 91—116.)

The defect in the system of Lagrange is its excess: *falsis vera involvit*. Though he disclaims to place history on the same plane as natural science, in some of his applications he does so. Nay more, as we have seen in his own words, he makes Leo XIII. in his encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" sponsor for this new theory. As we have given the papal encyclical complete in our present treatise, we refer to that to show the falsity of Lagrange's appeal. The Pope gives rules for dealing with the objections drawn from science; and then declares that men are to deal with kindred sciences and with history in the same manner. That is by showing that our

adversaries often demand more for their hypotheses than they are worth; by showing that many things formerly held by them are now abandoned; and by showing that what is clearly proven does not conflict with Scripture. These are the principles which the Pope advises to apply to history.

Fr. Delattre, S. J., has shown this conclusively in his "Autour de la Question Biblique" wherein he ably exposes the excesses of the system of Lagrange. It seems also that a recent decision of the Biblical Commission sanctioned by the Pope, forbids some of the applications of Lagrange's theory.

This is the wording of the question proposed to the Commission: "Is it lawful for the Catholic exegetist to solve the difficulties occurring in certain texts of Sacred Scripture, which appear to relate historical facts, by asserting that in these we have to deal with a tacit or implicit quotation of a document written by an uninspired author, and that the inspired author did not at all intend to approve or adopt all of these assertions, which cannot, therefore, be held to be free from error?"

The answer reads: "In the negative, except in the case when, due regard being paid to the sense and judgment of the Church, it is proved by solid arguments; (1) that the sacred writer has really quoted the sayings or documents of another; and (2) that he has neither approved nor adopted them, so that he may be properly considered not to be speaking in his own name." This answer was submitted to the Holy Father, and signed and sanctioned by His Holiness on February 13, 1905.

In a private audience granted me in June of 1905, the Holy Father Pius X. spoke sadly of the tendencies of some Catholic scholars, who have been led away by the labored erudition of the Rationalists; and who have accepted some of the false principles of "higher criticism."

When Père Lagrange defends the theory that in scientific facts the inspired writers spoke according to appearances, he says nothing new; the principle has been handed down from the Fathers. When he admits the presence of allegory, parable, and metaphor in the Holy Books, especially

in the early chapters of Genesis, we agree fully with him. But when he applies his theory of appearances to real historical personages there is an excess. For instance, when the Scriptures declare that Joshua arrested the course of the sun it affirms a truth, a truth that could not have been better enunciated by the most accomplished astronomer of our day. It affirms that a day was miraculously lengthened. The same is true when it is asserted that God created a firmament. It assigns to God the creation of the universe which is spoken of as the ancients saw it. But when the Scriptures assert that Sarah went down into Egypt, and was taken into Pharaoh's house, if the account be not true as history, nothing is true. Every circumstance proclaims that the writer wished to be understood as writing genuine history. And yet, Lagrange disposes of the event as follows:

"Can that whole story which God willed to be preserved be said to be above the imperfections of the religious truth of those days? Did it come more directly from God to our souls than does the religious truth on which we look to the Church for a final decision?"

Lagrange asserts that he preserves the groundwork of the history, and applies the theory of folk-lore only to the details; but one may see by his own application of his system that he treats as details substantial records of events such as the incest of Lot, the destruction of Sodom, the rape of Sarah, etc. Now these events are recorded as history; they have no purpose if they be legendary; and it seems incompatible with the Church's definitions to declare such narratives to be merely folk-lore.

The phrase folk-lore is a favorite expression of Lagrange. In his theory, primitive history ceases to be history. It is simply a collection of folk-lore; and its relation to religion lies only in this, that no false ideas of faith or morals are found therein. Thus monotheism purifies primitive history from the errors of the folk-lore of the idolatrous nations. We believe that this theory is false for the reason that it does not leave to the Bible the character attributed to it by the Church. The error is in an excessive application of a

principle which has a substratum of truth. It may well be admitted that in the mere details of facts of history absolute precision is not demanded in order that it be true history; but no theory may lawfully be applied to the history of the Bible which makes any part of it anything but true history. It must be true history; and its facts must be true, even though they have no immediate relation to doctrine or morals. We can not reason here *a priori*; it is not for us to determine how God should have delivered his message: the definition of the Church, though it leaves a free ground for discussion, allows no man a theory which makes any part of the Bible other than true history. Allegories, parables and metaphors presented in their proper setting are not inconsistent with the truthful character of a book; but the myths, fables, and legends of folk-lore presented as history are formally false, and can not be a part of a book of which God is the Author.

In 1904, the Rev. Ferd. Prat, S. J., published a small brochure entitled *La Bible et l'Histoire*. The work is a synthesis of the opinions of Lagrange, and adds little that is new. He also invokes the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* in support of the *historical method*. Others who have in a more or less degree favored the *new exegesis* are Alfred Durand (*Revue du Clergé français*), F. Girerd (*Annales de philosophie chrétienne*), P. Batiffol (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*), G. Bonaccorsi (*Studi religiosi*), Vincent Zapletal, and Vincent Rose.

As before stated, we believe the evil of the new theory to lie in its excess, and hence care must be taken to distinguish what sound dogma may admit in the *new exegesis*. This is an exegetical question and can not be treated here.

It is however not in accordance with truth to invoke the encyclical of Leo XIII. in support of these theories. The words of the encyclical itself and many other utterances of the pontiff manifest that he condemned the ultra views of the very men who cite the "*Providentissimus Deus*" in support of their theories. It is also ridiculous to allege St. Jerome as authority for the historical method. The before mentioned work of Fr. Delattre has clearly demonstrated the falsity of this claim.

The able presentation of the new theories has proven the truth of the Latin proverb: "Nihil est tam improbable quod probando not fiat probabile."

The Belgian Benedictin Dom. Sanders published in 1903, a treatise under the title "Études sur St. Jerome" in which he attempted to base the liberal exegesis on the authority of St. Jerome. The Literar. Rundschau, XXXI., 1905, has ably shown the defective critique of Dom. Sanders' work. It is a mangling of history to compel it to support a theory already determined.

Alfred Loisy has drifted so far from orthodoxy that it is scarcely worth our while to examine his views on inspiration. In his *Études Bibliques* (Paris, 1901) he discusses the new science of criticism as applied to the Bible. He declares that "Scripture contains a divine and a human element; but these two elements so compenetrates each other that they form a divine-human work in which the divine action and the human action cannot be separated. These two operations act *per modum unius*, as the Scholastics say. An inspired book is wholly the work of God, and wholly the work of man. To distinguish the inspiration of the matter from the non-inspired words; or to assign the dogmatic and moral texts to God, and assign other things to the human author is to operate the vivisection of the books."

M. Loisy next proceeds to admit a "*relative element*" in the scriptures. This relative element comes from the fact that the books express the beliefs of the times in science and in certain parts of history. The Scriptures were adapted to the conditions of the times, and hence with the progress of science an imperfection is revealed, and this must always be verified in human progress. That which men call errors in the Scripture is nothing more than its *relative part*, which marks the stage of human progress at the date of the origin of the book. There will thus be an ever changing element in exegesis as human progress goes on; and there will be a fixed element, for the church safeguards the truths which never change. In a word the inspired book is a product of the times, and reflects the state of learning, of customs, and in a way, of the moral code of the times. Hence the first

eleven chapters of Genesis are not historical; but a presentation of the philosophy of creation in the form of the Chaldean traditions.

In consequence of these views M. Loisy was compelled to leave the Catholic Institute of Paris, where he had taught for twelve years. Five of his works are on the Index of prohibited books. It seems quite evident that Pius X. had the opinions of M. Loisy in mind when in his allocution to the newly created cardinals on April 18, 1907, he declared: "As for tradition, everything is relative and subject to mutations; consequently the authority of the holy Fathers is reduced to a nullity."

Zanecchia is a pronounced advocate of the new exegesis. He follows closely the teaching of Lagrange, but is bolder in applying them. We reproduce here a few passages in the original Latin from his most recent work, "*Scriptor sacer sub div. Insp. juxta sent. Card. Franzelin, Romae 1903.*" "*In sacris ergo libris qui historici appellantur, sub forma historica qua conscripti fuerunt, non semper vera historia factorum eorumque chronologicus ordo reperitur, quia scopus hagiographorum non erat ubique veram historiam humanarum rerum tradere, sed communiter utebantur historicis notionibus, et prout in vulgo erant, ad religiosas vel morales veritates docendas. Qui proinde in ea quae sacra historia vocatur accuratam veramque historiam ubique reperire praesumit, se exponit certo periculo inveniendi non historicam veritatem sed historicos errores, qui tamen neque Deo inspiranti neque hagiographo scribenti imputari possunt, sed unice inquirenti historicam veritatem ubi nec Deus nec hagiographus eam docuerunt [docuit].*"

"Demum nihil prohibet scriptorem sacrum ad ostendendam processionem omnium creaturarum a Deo, uti documentis ac traditionibus in quibus rerum eventus plus vel minus poetica descriptione narrantur. Sic in primis Genesis capitibus introductio dierum in instantanea creatione, ordo quo res a Deo processerunt, descriptio formationis protoparentum, eorum felicitas ante lapsum, descriptio paradisi voluptatis, arboris vitae et arboris scientiae boni ac mali in medio paradisi, fluvii qui inde egrediens in quattuor partes

dividebatur, relatio colloquii Dei cum lapsis protoparentibus, tunicarum pellicearum quibus Deus eos vestivit etc., sunt narrationes veridicae quantum ad radicem eventuum, sed in earum forma descriptiva orientalis poetica extranea non fuit. Hagiographus autem narrationes illas accepit prout in usu erant apud populos, et in sacro Libro retulit, non quidem ut auctoritate propria illas approbaret, praesertim in earum forma, sed quatenus lumine inspirativo iudicavit conscribendas esse, ut populi cognoscerent cuncta mundi bona non alium praeter Deum auctorem habuisse, qui specialem providentiam erga hominem manifestavit, singularemque misericordiam una cum iustitia in eum ostendit." . . .

"Ut igitur concludamus, narrationes biblicae neque omnes historicam veritatem habent, neque omnes historica veritate destitutae sunt, et quamplures ex eis inveniuntur, in quibus fundamentum designat veridicum atque historicum factum, forma vero et circumstantiae quibus traditur ex poetica arte proveniunt. Similiter omnes biblicae assertiones veritatem continent, haec tamen neque semper absoluta est, neque ubique relativa manet, sed in aliquibus absoluta est et in aliis relativa. Vera itaque intelligentia Scripturae maximam eruditionem requirit, ubi vero haec non sufficit, expectandum est iudicium Ecclesiae, cuius est iudicare de vero sensu ac interpretatione Scripturarum."

For more than twenty years the new exegesis was being propagated with great activity in France, England, and in other lands before Catholic scholars in Germany entered into the movement. In 1903, the *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* reproached the German theologians (Bardenhewer, Hoberg, etc.) with being *stationary*, and with not realizing that there was a *biblical question*. In 1902, Prof. Karl Holzhey published his work "*Schoepfung, Bibel und Inspiration*," (Vienna and Stuttgart). Though more temperate than the French "*école large*," Holzhey admits an imperfect side of the Scriptures. The inspired writer has his own individuality, and impresses it on his work. He is also the *child of his times*, and impresses on his work the beliefs of his age. Divine inspiration is consistent with

these imperfections. The inspired writer never utters a formal lie; but is not necessarily ahead of his age except in the case of direct revelation. Holzhey then asks the question: Whether inspiration so strengthens the writer's human judgment that he commits no substantial error. In his answer he distinguishes between the main truth which the writer wished to express and the mode of expression. The mode of expression is not necessarily determined by divine power. Again as the very nature of a human work is to be human and therefore imperfect, without a series of miracles the work of the inspired writer cannot be totally preserved from imperfections. In these there is no formal falsehood: the writer has made use of his data honestly and truthfully; but yet as the work bears the impress of a human author, it will also have human imperfections. Holzhey condemns the theory restricting inspiration to things of faith and morals, and will not exempt "obiter dicta" from inspiration. He extends inspiration to all the Scripture; but the cooperation of the divine and human elements leaves a certain human imperfection in the work, not of a nature to defeat God's purpose.

In 1904, Fr. Franz von Hummelauer, S. J., published in the series of "Biblische Studien" a brochure entitled "Exegetisches zur Inspirationsfrage." This work caused much amazement to those who had known the learned exegete's work in the "Cursus Scripturae Sacrae." Fr. von Hummelauer is a pronounced advocate of the new Exegesis. The ground principle of his whole system is the greater role given to the human side of inspiration. He confesses in the foreword that he has made large study of French works on the subject, which admission prepares us to find in his work the influence of the "école large". He declares that the time is not yet come to formulate definitive theories on inspiration; but yet he puts forth his hypothesis in a very positive manner. Von Hummelauer groups his views under three heads: "(1) the form of literature in which the narrative portions of the Old Testament have come down to us; (2) the human side of Biblical inspiration; (3) the human authors of the inspired books."

Von Hummelauer acknowledges that he is more a collector of what others have written than an original creator of his treatise. And true enough on the first page we find the principle of Lagrange: Every word in the Bible is true in the sense that God and the inspired writer understood it and wrote it. The sense of the human author is determined by what von Hummelauer calls the remote context, that is the literary form of the inspired work.

Father von Hummelauer draws the attention of his readers not merely to the historical novel, but also to the fable, the parable, the epic; again, to the form of *religious* history, of antique history, of national tradition or folk-lore, of the Midrash, and of the prophetic or apocalyptic narrative. The author believes that God can move the inspired writer to make use of one and all of these various literary forms in his narratives. And what becomes of Biblical inerrancy in this case? An inspired parable, or epic, or historical novel is truthful in the same way in which profane works of the respective literary form are considered truthful. The reader well knows that the *religious* historian makes the material and the form of his narrative subservient to edification; he knows that the *antique* historian represents his facts in an artistically free form; that in folk-lore, fiction is not limited to form, but extends to the contents of the narrative, though some, and perhaps a great many, of its statements, may be historically true; that the Midrash resembles our passion-play in representing a Biblical narrative in such a way as to inculcate a religious or moral lesson; finally, that the apocalyptic narrative contains a great many symbolic representations.

According to Fr. von Hummelauer, several of the Old Testament narratives actually present some of the foregoing literary forms. Scholz had suggested that the Book of Judith might be a parable, but Fr. Prat mentions the Book in connection with the Midrash.¹ The epic is represented in the psalms on creation, *e. g.*, Ps. 135, and on Pharaoh's death in the Red Sea. The historical novel is

¹ *Etudes*, 1902, iv., 625.

mentioned in connection with the Books of Ruth, Judith, Esther, and Tobias by such writers as Fr. Prat,² Fr. Brucker³ Scholz,⁴ Schanz,⁵ Vigouroux,⁶ E. Cosquin,⁷ L. Fonck,⁸ A. Durand,⁹ Lagrange,¹⁰ and Gayraud.¹¹ Finally, von Hummelauer is of opinion that the Book of Genesis presents the form of national tradition or folk-lore, while the Book of Ruth may be considered as a form of family tradition. He gives three reasons for his view as to the Book of Genesis: (1) The formula 'these are the generations' or 'this is the book of the generation' occurs some ten times in Genesis, and replaces the Hebrew expression '*elle toledoth*'; it appears to be agreed that the rendering is not exact, but the Rev. author believes that the rendering 'this is the national tradition concerning heaven and earth,' or 'this is the folk-lore concerning Adam,' would be correct. The author of Genesis claims, therefore, to write a series of national traditions. (2) The primeval records of all other nations have passed into national tradition or folk-lore; now, there is no evidence to prove a special divine intervention in favor of the earliest Hebrew records. (3) The first eleven chapters of Genesis present a remarkable affinity to the national traditions of other nations, so that we naturally consider them as their Hebrew parallels.

Fr. Von Hummelauer considers in the second part of his pamphlet the historian of the Old Testament rather than any other inspired author. The author supposes the wellknown principle that by merely quoting a source we do not become responsible for the objective truthfulness of the same. A quotation is true if it faithfully reproduces

² *Etudes*, 1902, iv., 624 ff. .

³ *Etudes*, 1903, i., 231.

⁴ *Kommentar über d. B. Judith u. über Bel u Drache*; Leipzig, 1898.

⁵ *Apologie*, 576, 582.

⁶ *Revue Biblique*, 1899, 50.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 50 ff.

⁸ *Civiltà Catt.*, 1903, x., 580.

⁹ *Revue du Clergé franç.*, 1902, xxxiii., 8.

¹⁰ *La méthode historique*, Paris, 1903, 83 ff.; *Revue Biblique*, 1896, 511.

¹¹ *Revue du Clergé franç.*, 1903, xxxiv., 118.

the original text. In the same way, a history of Rome according to Livy, *e. g.*, does not vouch for the objective truthfulness of the narrative; such a history is true, if it faithfully represents the history of Rome according to the record of Livy. It cannot be called in question that the Bible contains quotations, and at times these quotations are said to be colorless so that they cannot be distinguished from their context except by critical means.*

Rev. Fr. von Hummelauer maintains that the Books of Samuel, of Kings, and of Paralipomenon are a history of Israel according to the Annals quoted in these books and corrected according to the prophetic source utilized by the writers; that II. Mach., III.—XV. professes to be a history according to the writings of Jason, that the Books of Joshua, Judges, and of I. Mach. must be considered historical in the same way in which the foregoing books are historical; that most of the Old Testament quotations found in the New Testament are citations according to the Septuagint translation; that several typical applications of Old Testament passages on the part of New Testament writers may have been made according to the current interpretation of Judaism; that finally the names of the Old Testament authors are given by New Testament writers according to the current Jewish tradition. In none of these cases, therefore, can we hold the inspired writer responsible for the objective truthfulness of his course, unless he freely vouches for the same. This does not impair the historical character of the inspired books; for they are as truthful as historical documents usually are. In fact, they are more reliable than other historical documents, seeing that gross errors are incompatible with the dignity of an inspired work. Nor does this explanation conflict with the Fathers, seeing that they explained away their historical difficulties by having recourse to a spiritual meaning of Sacred Scripture.

Von Hummelauer cites Pope Leo's encyclical as authority for his views, and repeats the formula of Lagrange, that the inspired writer is the child of his times, that he stands

* Cf. Prat, *Etudes*, 1901, i, 485; Durand, *Revue du Clergé franç.*, 1902, xxxiii., 20 ff.; Lagrange, *Revue Biblique*, 1896, 508.

on the scientific plane of his age, and his knowledge is limited by the horizon of his age. Therefore we must not read our opinions into the books, but draw the author's opinions out of them. He concludes that the question within proper limits belongs not to dogma, but to literary criticism.

Fr. von Hummelauer quotes the following sentence from Durand (*Revue du Clergé français* XXXIII., 1902): "Men have compared the inspired word of God with the Incarnate Word of God. The Apostle says that the Incarnate Word was made like to us in all save sin: we may say that the inspired word becomes a human utterance in all save error." Von Hummelauer evidently accepts this as a most apt simile. He develops it still further: "Yes, that (error) is the bound which is reached but not passed. The Son of God was sinless, but he was tempted: he was not to see corruption; but he died and was buried. Man's word having become God's word is free of error, but it comes to the bound of error. Not to it is stranger the *argumentum ad hominem* which uses error, though it does not affirm error."

It seems that this example is most unfitting and irreverent. It proves nothing for the new exegesis. In the category of sin there was no weakness in the Son of God: he was not tempted from within. He did not *come to the bound of sin*, and there stop. So likewise we may logically argue that in the category of error there is no weakness in the Scriptures; they do not stop at the boundary of error. They have human elements corresponding to the human in Christ; they are not always written in the finest style; the expression may not always be the most apt; they employ the scientific notions of their time; but their enunciations are always true. Though they treated history without the critical method, they were upheld by the power of God to write true history.

In our review of the liberal opinions on inspiration we have not contemplated to give all the authors. We have given the ablest exponents, and we believe that those omitted add nothing new to the principles here reviewed. Fr. Hildebrand Höpfl (*das Buch der Bücher*, Freiburg, 1904), closely follows Zaneccchia; Engelkemper (*die Paradieses*

flüsse, 1901) and Norbert Peters (die grundsätzliche Stellung der Katholischen Kirche zur Bibelforschung, Paderborn, 1905). add nothing to the theories of Holzhey and von Hummelauer.

Before closing this review of the liberal opinions we submit a brief notice of the manner in which the adherents of the New Exegesis present what they choose to call St. Jerome's "law of history."

In the XXVII. chapter of Jeremiah is narrated that Jeremiah prophesied the Babylonian captivity. In the XXVIII. chapter, Hananiah, the son of Azzur, contradicts Jeremiah, and declares that within two years the God of Israel shall break the yoke of the King of Babylon. The Lord reveals to Jeremiah that Hananiah had spoken a lying prophecy. Jeremiah charges the false prophet with the lie, and announces to him that he should die that same year, which duly came to pass.

The Hebrew mentions Hananiah as "Hananiah the son of Azzur the prophet who was of Gabaon." The Septuagint departs from the Hebrew, and calls him a pseudo-prophet.

"In his comment. on Jer. XXVIII. 10-11, Jerome writes: 'The Seventy do not translate the clause 'two years.' Neither do they speak of Ananias as a *prophet*, lest they should seem to call him a prophet who was not a prophet: *as if many things were not spoken of in the Sacred Scriptures according to the opinion of that age, in which the events are related, and not according to the intrinsic truth of the thing itself* (quasi non multa in Scripturis Sanctis dicantur juxta opinionem illius temporis quo gesta referuntur, et non juxta quod rei veritas continebat). Even Joseph is called in the Gospel the *father* of the Lord.'" A little further in his commentary on Jer. XXIX, 5 ff., St. Jerome repeats: "How could Holy Scripture thus call him a prophet, although it is denied in Holy Scripture itself that he had been sent by the Lord? But *truth and the law of history is observed*, as we said before, *not according to what was, but according to what was believed at that time* (Sed *historiæ veritas et ordo servatur, sicut prædiximus, non juxta quod erat, sed juxta id quod illo tempore putabatur.*"

In the first place it is a strange process to appeal to Jerome as supreme judge to decide a matter of criticism. Jerome was of impulsive temperament, often expressed his opinions hastily, and often contradicts himself. No Catholic accepts his theoretical views on the deuterocanonical books. Hence we might set aside this testimony by a mere *transeat*. But it seems to us that the école large have stretched its application far beyond what Jerome intended. In the Scriptural passage itself there is no difficulty. Everyone knows that in the Scripture false prophets are often called prophets. The interpreters of the Septuagint were hypercritical in substituting pseudo-prophets, since there was no danger of error in the original text. Now if Jerome's remark has any point at all, it must mean that the Scriptures call these men prophets for the reason that they were commonly so termed, and not for the reason that the people believed them to be true prophets. In his Commentary on Ezekiel (M. t. XXV., Col. 108) Jerome makes clearer his meaning. He there treats of the same case, false prophets (Ezek. XIII. 1), and Jerome justifies their being called prophets in the Scripture: "Let it not disturb anyone that they are called prophets; for the Holy Scripture usually calls a prophet any one prophesying; thus are called the prophets of Baal, the prophets of idols, and the prophets of confusion. And also Paul the Apostle calls the Greek poet a prophet (Titus I. 12): 'One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said: Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, idle bellies.'" It is evident in Paul's quotation that he uses that word prophet in a loose sense, meaning that the verse of Epimenides was prophetically true of the Cretans. Jerome's meaning is simply to justify the Scriptural use of the word prophet. We do not assert that his statement is clear or cogent, but it can not have the wide application that the liberal school give it.

Let us hear how St. Jerome explains the fact that in Holy Scripture, St. Joseph is called the *father* of Christ; and the Virgin Mary the *wife* of St. Joseph. ["Adversus Helvidium," n. 4.]

"Excepting Joseph and Elizabeth and Mary herself, and some few others who, we may suppose, heard the truth from them, *all considered Jesus to be the Son of Joseph*. And so far was this the case that even *the Evangelists, expressing the opinion of the people, which is the true law of history* (*quæ vera historiæ lex est*), called him the *father* of the Saviour: as, for instance, 'And he (that is, Simeon) came in the Spirit into the temple; and when the *parents* brought in the child Jesus;' and elsewhere, 'And his *parents* went every year to Jerusalem.' And afterwards, 'The boy Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem and his *parents* knew not of it.' Observe also that Mary herself, who had replied to Gabriel with the words: 'How shall this be, since I know not man?' says concerning Joseph: 'Son why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, *thy father* and I sought thee sorrowing.' We have not here, as many maintain, the utterance of Jews or mockers. *The Evangelists call Joseph father; Mary says he was father*. Not, as I said before, that Joseph *was really* the father of the Saviour: but that, to preserve the reputation of Mary, he *was regarded by all* as his father. . . . But we have said enough, more with the aim of imparting instruction than of answering an opponent, to show *why* Joseph is called the *father* of our Lord, and why Mary is called Joseph's *wife*.'

In his commentary on St. Matthew XIV., 9, St. Jerome applies the same principle, which he calls "the law of history," to the statement read in the Gospel that King Herod "*was struck sad*," because the daughter of Herodias said: "Give me here in a dish the head of John the Baptist."

St. Jerome does not believe that Herod was sorry. "*It is the manner of Scripture*," he says, "*that the historian relates the opinion of the multitude, as it was commonly viewed at that time*." (*Consuetudinis Scripturarum est opinionem multorum sic narret historicus quomodo eo tempore ab omnibus credebatur*). As Joseph was called, even by Mary herself, the *father* of Jesus, so here Herod is said to have been *struck sad*, because the *banqueters* thought he was. The hypocrite indeed and the homicide simulated sadness in his countenance, although he was really joyful in his heart."

The best answer to these two testimonies is to admit that Jerome erred in both cases, and consequently his opinion is based on error, and is worthless. The Scriptures call Jesus the son of Joseph, not to accommodate themselves to a popular error, but because he was born in a lawful wedlock, and not of fornication; and because Joseph was the real husband of the Mother of God. Secondly, it is clear that Jerome errs in believing that Herod was not at heart sad. There is not the slightest warrant for such supposition. Jerome's supposition makes the Gospel ridiculous. In fact one of the ardent disciples of the école large admits that Jerome is in error: "As a matter of fact, we believe that, not the Evangelist, but St. Jerome was mistaken. King Herod was indeed 'struck sad' because he feared the people. But his mistake does not, of course, touch our question about the *exegetic principle* of St. Jerome." (H. Poels in Catholic University Bulletin, Jan., 1905). How may Catholic writers ever expect to harmonize their views, when such arguments are used? In order to add authority to their theory, they cite Jerome's weaknesses, of which he had many, as the supreme law in this crisis of Catholic faith.

It is not our intention to mention all those who have arisen to defend the Church on the question of inspiration. Two however, deserve special mention.

Fr. Murillo [El Movimiento Reformista y la Exegesis; *Razón y Fe*, December, 1904; January, etc., 1905.] has published a series of articles against Fr. von Hummelauer's views and all kindred theories of exegesis. Among those reasons which he urges against the view of Oriental or ancient history assumed by our recent Catholic apologists, he appeals to Cicero's canon of history: *ne quid falsi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat: ne qua suspicio gratiae sit in scribendo ne qua simultas*. [De Orat. 11 15.] Murillo denies that historical fiction or romance is as effective as historical truth for inculcating moral principles; he does not see why it cannot be said that the Evangelists too related the life of Christ according to the Oriental historical method, if the latter be compatible with the character of an inspired book.

A still more important work in defense of a safe and sane theory of inspiration is the work "*De Inspiratione Sacrae Scripturae, Romae, 1903,*" by Fr. L. Billot, S. J.

After reviewing the various forms under which the new doctrines present themselves, Billot declares them to be contrary to the attributes of God and to the veracity of the Scriptures. He takes up their principles as follows: "Their first principle is that the inspired writers were neither more nor less than profane writers. This is false; for an instrumental cause is not in the same category of causality as a principal cause. Profane writers are the principal cause of their works; while the inspired writers are only the instrumental cause of their works: therefore there is no parity.

"Their second principle is that it pertains to the inspired writers to determine the literary form of their books. This is false, for the reason that it pertains to the principal author to determine the species of truth which is to be presented in a book, and sought therein. For our literary critics have in mind that literary form on which the whole sense of the book depends, and which is the directive principle of the entire interpretation. Therefore it is the literary form which determines the character of the book. Now if that by which a book receives its specific character be not from God, but from man, how is God the principal Author?

"Their third principle is that there is no literary form received among men which the inspiration of the Holy Ghost rejects. This is false, if it be understood of the literary forms which they imagine, especially that unspeakable genius of Oriental history. . . . It is false for the reason that divine inspiration can not accept our defects, our ignorance, our vices, our rashness, our vanity. For the genus of literature, which they imagine, more properly should be called a genus of vanity, wherein there is no excuse; or if there be an excuse, ignorance must excuse the error, and rashness the ignorance. Now God corrects our defects but does not accept them. And if we appeal to the simile which the new biblicists employ, the Word made flesh did not assume any of the defects which springing from sin take away something of the plenitude of knowledge and grace;

but he dwelt among us full of grace and truth. Much less therefore in that operation (inspiration) which is proper not to his assumed nature, but to his divine nature can he participate in our defects by inspiring books of primitive myths and Oriental history." Here Billot especially aims to overthrow the theory of Loisy:

"La vérité divine, pour se manifester aux hommes, s'est incarnée comme le Verbe éternel. Le Fils de Dieu nous est devenu semblable en tout, sauf le péché. Et la Bible aussi ressemble en toutes choses à un livre de l'antiquité qui aurait été rédigé dans les mêmes conditions historiques, à l'exception d'un seul défaut qui la rendrait impropre à sa destination providentielle, et ce défaut serait l'enseignement formel d'une . . . erreur quelconque présentée comme vérité divine. Mais. . . les interprètes de la révélation divine . . . se sont conformés aux procédés littéraires employés de leur temps, et ils ont moulé en quelque sorte la vérité révélée dans le cadre des opinions communes et des traditions de leur race, sauf à rectifier dans ces données . . . ce qui pouvait contredire les principes essentiels de la vérité religieuse." Loisy, *Etudes bibliques*, p. 34.

Billot severely handles the theory of implicit quotations: "Let us now come to the implicit quotations which are a great part of the new invention. . . . Under the name of an implicit quotation is understood the tacit employment of a document which the author inserts in his narration on its own authority, and for whose truth the author does not vouch. . . . Whatever literary form be supposed, whatever customs and conventions prevailing in different times and places, we must always believe in our hearts and confess that the holy books were written at the dictation of the Holy Ghost, and indeed the entire books and all their parts, and therefore all and every one of the so called implicit quotations. For if a properly so called explicit quotation is a true part of a book which proceeds from the author as any other part . . . how much the more an implicit quotation which is incorporated into the body of the narration without any reference? It must be conceded therefore that the implicit quotations were inserted by the inspired

writers not of their own motive and industry, but under the direction of God. . . . The human writer finds a document of whose value he is ignorant; nevertheless he copies it, and inserts it into his narration, taking a certain risk, judging that in any case he may be excused, partly on account of a presumptive probability of the veracity of the document, partly on account of the considerations which our *critics* have ingeniously invented; let this pass. But what shall we judge of him to whom the falsity of the document is known, and who notwithstanding this certain conscience, should insert this document into his narration? Shall we forsooth distinguish historical honesty into western and Eastern? into ancient and modern? In this case even Oriental honesty would hardly be preserved. Wherefore since God is neither western nor eastern, neither ancient nor modern; since moreover those things which are false he does not apprehend as probably possibly true, but certainly knows them to be false; since finally with him avail nothing those usages and conventions which the ignorance or vanity of men has introduced, we understand how from his dictation there can not come forth an implicit quotation of a false document. And therefore from first to last, the doctrine of implicit quotations, understood in the sense and to the end that the new exegetes understand it, most evidently is to be rejected.

"Let the final conclusion be that in treating of literary forms they would argue more wisely if instead of seeking a genus of literature in which to place the Holy Books they would acknowledge that the Holy Scriptures form a genus apart, transcendent, unlike all other books. . . . It is fitting that the books of which God is the principal Author should have a manner of speech proper to themselves."

The examination of the various theories of inspiration has brought us now to a point where we must adopt certain principles as our working theory of inspiration. Most of the adherents of the new exegesis in investigating the nature of inspiration make their point of departure not the action of God in inspiration, but the books themselves. In this there is excess. Inspiration is a supernatural effect, and is

not revealed to us by the books themselves, but comes to us from God through the founts of revelation. Therefore we can not build up a theory of inspiration *a posteriori* from an examination of the books themselves. The process is legitimate to study the books to see what effects the action of God works in them; but there must always be the directive principle in our minds that these books were written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and have God for their Author.

In seeking the nature of inspiration we must separate it from extraneous questions. The Church does not admit as inspired, any writing of later origin than the Apostles. This has been a consistent teaching of the Church. But if this principle be accepted, the question of inspiration does not occupy itself with the question: Who are the authors of the inspired books? Neither does it concern inspiration to discern whether a book be of one human author or of many. To treat of the human authors is a separate question. Inspiration is sure of one divine Author; but it is not essential to it to define its human authors. At times it has done it, but only *per accidens*. Certain books, as many of St. Paul's epistles, declare their human authorship under the guarantee of divine inspiration; of other books the authors will ever remain unknown; of some, the authorship is merely probable.

Fr. Christian Pesch believes that no genus of literature is *per se* excluded from inspiration. It seems to us that this principle needs some restrictions. By the fact of inspiration the Holy Books are unlike all other books. They are a transcendent genus of literature. Their modes of presenting truth may have affinities with the various forms of literature; but there is not an identity. And moreover there are certain species of literature whose end seems to be incompatible with the end of Scripture. For instance the epic poem is based on mythical heroes, and we can find no place in the plan and purpose of the Holy Scripture for the epic poem.

The novel is a fictitious prose narrative or tale, involving some plot of more or less intricacy, and aiming to present a

picture of real life in the historical period and society to which the persons, manners, and modes of speech, as well as the scenery and surroundings are supposed to belong. We look in vain in this definition for anything which could have been the aim of any of the Holy Books.

The fable is a story or history untrue in fact or substance, invented or developed by popular or poetic fancy or superstition, and to some extent or at one time current in popular belief as true and real. Now rigorously speaking perhaps we may apply the term to some portions of Holy Writ. Lexicographers tell us that the parable is a species of fable. But certainly the fable as popularly understood finds no place in Scripture.

There are two species of literature which we believe must absolutely be excluded from Scripture. The legend is an unauthentic and improbable or non-historical narrative handed down from early times. It is the product of a people's imagination, a mere creation of fancy. Some legends teach moral truth, but not as we expect it to be taught in Holy Scripture. Once admit the presence of legends in the Scriptures and the basis of the Holy Scriptures is shaken. Parables and allegories are also fictitious history, but of another kind. The parable openly bears evidence that it is a species of similitude: in the allegory, one thing true and real is described under the image of another. In parables and allegories the symbolical character of the narrative is distinctly recognized.

Still more do we exclude from Holy Scripture the myth, which is false history believed to be true. It is imaginary history having no existence in fact. It is not aimed to point a moral; it only expresses a people's superstitious conceptions of primitive history. We believe that the divine element of inspiration excludes from Holy Scriptures the novel, the fable in its popular sense, the epic poem, the legend, and the myth. And the reason is that they are not true, and the Scriptures are true.

These forms of literature being excluded, there remain many other forms of literature which Holy Writ employs, and consequently the divine influence manifests itself in

Holy Scripture in different modes. We find in Jeremiah a good description of the manner in which the Holy Ghost delivers a written prophecy. We do not say that all prophecy in the strict sense was delivered in this way; but it is a representative specimen:

“And it came to pass in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah, that this word came unto Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Take thee a roll of a book, and write therein all the words that I have spoken unto thee against Israel, and against Judah, and against all the nations, from the day I spake unto thee, from the days of Josiah, even unto this day. It may be that the house of Judah will hear all the evil which I purpose to do unto them; that they may return every man from his evil way; that I may forgive their iniquity and their sin. Then Jeremiah called Baruch the son of Neriah; and Baruch wrote from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the Lord, which he had spoken unto him, upon a roll of a book.” [Jer. XXXVI., 1-4.]

Jeremiah executes the command, and Baruch reads the message. Then the princes ask the manner of the communication from Heaven: “And they asked Baruch, saying, Tell us now, How didst thou write all these words at his mouth? Then Baruch answered them, He pronounced all these words unto me with his mouth.” [Jer. XXXVI. 17-18.]

King Jehoiakim burns the scroll, and God commands that another be written:

“Then the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, after that the king had burned the roll, and the words which Baruch wrote at the mouth of Jeremiah, saying, Take thee again another roll, and write in it all the former words that were in the first roll, which Jehoiakim the king of Judah hath burned. And concerning Jehoiakim king of Judah thou shalt say, Thus saith the Lord: Thou hast burned this roll, saying, Why hast thou written therein, saying, The king of Babylon shall certainly come and destroy this land, and shall cause to cease from thence man and beast? Therefore thus saith the Lord concerning Jehoiakim king of Judah: He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David: and his

dead body shall be cast out in the day to the heat, and in the night to the frost. And I will punish him and his seed and his servants for their iniquity; and I will bring upon them, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and upon the men of Judah, all the evil that I have pronounced against them, but they hearkened not. Then took Jeremiah another roll, and gave it to Baruch the scribe, the son of Neriah; who wrote therein from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the book which Jehoiakim king of Judah had burned in the fire: and there were added besides unto them many like words." [Jer. XXXVI. 27—32.]

While the direct influence of God here is most potent, it does not justify a mechanical theory of verbal inspiration. God's message came to the Prophet in mental words; as it came forth from Jeremiah's lips the impress of God was upon thoughts and words; but still it is not necessary to make the mind of Jeremiah act as a mere phonograph. Intellect and memory exercised their proper functions in receiving and delivering the words of God. It is evident from the account that the consigning of it to writing did not take place at the very moment that God spoke to the prophet. Jeremiah received the message, and his memory preserved it. In reproducing it for writing, his memory was supernaturally aided by God; but there is no warrant for multiplying miracles to the extent that every word be placed ready made in Jeremiah's mind. In dealing with this subtle action of God it is difficult to describe in words the mental processes with which God co-operates. We may illustrate by an example. Let us suppose that the same identical message came to Jeremiah and to another prophet; and that both executed the command to write it. In the two accounts we should expect to find the same modal differences that are found in the several accounts of the words of institution of the Blessed Sacrament at the Last Supper.

In investigating the nature of inspiration we have the certain principle that God is the principal Author of Holy Scripture, and that the human authors are the instrumental causes. It follows also that they are living rational instruments, and in conformity with the certain theological

principle, God employed the faculties of these instruments to write the Holy Books. Inasmuch as these created faculties were incapable of effecting the Holy Books, God elevated and strengthened them, and thus used them to deliver his message, so that one effect the Holy Books, comes forth from a double causality. This action of God thus enabling a man to accomplish a writing above his natural powers is aptly called *charismatic*. The Church has done more than tell us that God has inspired the writers of Scripture; St. Thomas, St. Gregory the Great, the author of the Imitation of Christ, and many others have been given of the grace of God which might truly be called inspiration; but the inspiration which moved the human authors of the Bible was of that nature that it made God the Author of the Scriptures: they are the word of God. By this definition of inspiration the negative theory of inspiration of Chrismann and Jahn is excluded. Neither could a subsequent approbation by the Church give to any book the character which the Church infallibly declares to belong to her canonical books. As Franzelin rightly declared in the Vatican Council: "Because the Church is infallible she can define nothing as revealed truth which is not revealed by God; and in like manner through the same *charisma* of infallibility she can not put any book in the Canon of Holy Scripture which was not divinely inspired." (Coll. Lac. VII. 1621). It can not be argued against this theory that St. Paul thus approved the sayings of Aratus and Epimenides (Acts XVII. 28; Titus I. 12). St. Paul not only approves these sayings, but by incorporating them into his book makes them a part of his book. God is not the Author of those sayings as existing in the works of the two poets; but he is the Author of the citation of them and the approbation of them by which they became an integral part of an inspired book.

In every question there are two extremes. So here in defending full inspiration for the Holy Books, we must not run into the other extreme.

We have said before that revelation does not enter into the essence of inspiration. We mean here revelation in the strict sense. This takes place when God directly in-

fuses the ideas into a created mind, as in the Prophets and the Apocalypse of St. John. But there is an influence of God wherein he enlightens the mind better to receive and use naturally acquired knowledge. This is sometimes called revelation in a wide sense. It is clear that this is always present in inspiration. Sometimes this distinction is not adverted to, and the divine influence in Holy Scripture is spoken of as revelation. It is clearly evident that revelation, strictly speaking, does not extend to all the Scriptures. Often the writers indicate their human sources. The annals of the Kingdoms of Judah and Israel are in large part the indicated sources of the Books of Kings. In the Books of Chronicles we find sixteen different documents cited as sources. The writer of II. Maccabees certainly employed existing documents; and St. Luke asserts that he had gathered his materials from others.

St. Thomas clearly explains this doctrine of the Church as follows: "If into the mind of a man light be infused by God, not for the purpose of knowing certain supernatural things, but that he may know with the certitude of divine truth things which can be known by human reason, that species of prophecy is inferior to that which by mental visions imparts the knowledge of supernatural truth, which (later) prophecy all they had who are placed in the order of Prophets, for they fulfilled the prophetic office. Wherefore, they spoke in the person of God, saying to the people: 'Thus saith the Lord;' but the *hagiographs* spoke not so, for most of them spoke in most part of those things which can be known by human reason, and (they spoke) not in the person of God, but as men, but with the help of divine light." (2. 2. q. 173, a. 4.) From the fact that this divine light is omnipresent in the Holy Scriptures the whole Scripture is divinely revealed, and is the object of divine faith. But in this regard, we must bear in mind the principle of St. Thomas: "A thing pertains to the precept of faith in two ways: (1) it pertains to faith directly as the articles of faith which are promulgated to be believed for their own sake. . . . (2) Other things pertain to faith indirectly, inasmuch as they are not proposed to be believed for their

own sake, but for the reason that from the negation of these, something would follow contrary to faith, as for instance if one should deny that Isaac was Abraham's son, there would follow something contrary to faith, viz., that the Scripture contains falsehood." (I. Cor. XI. 4).

This teaching is of value against those who would restrict inspiration to things of faith and morals. It is true that our act of faith more immediately finds its object in the things of faith and morals; but it embraces this other equally immediate truth: We believe all that God has revealed (in the broad sense). Therefore the things revealed *per accidens* are included in our act of faith. Of course our act of faith presupposes the application of true hermeneutics to determine what is the true sense of the things not yet defined by the Church.

To produce a book the author must conceive the ideas in his mind and consign them to writing either in person or by another. Therefore in employing man as an instrument to execute a writing, God must illumine his mind in the very act of conceiving the thoughts. This illumination will be a strict revelation in certain cases, as before explained; in things of natural reason or even mysteries learned through natural means it will be revelation in the larger sense, and both degrees of God's action are inspiration.

God also moves the will of the author to write, and assists him so that he properly executes the writing in a manner worthy of the word of God. Not alone by an internal moving of the will does God bring about the writing—he uses external circumstances and agents. Thus the things impelling to write may be friendship, or a special request, or a special need of a particular church, etc. But with the natural knowledge of the things to be written and with the natural motives impelling to write, God co-operates, strengthening the intelligence, and moving the free will so that there is inevitably produced a book which God wills to be his word, inspired and free from error.

It is not difficult to understand why God should illumine the created intelligence even in the act of writing things naturally known. Without the help of God, man could not

impress upon his writings the stamp of absolute infallible truth, even in the things which he knows by his own industry. We know that at times we experience a greater intellectual vigor, and that we can then judge better, and write better. In dealing with natural phenomena, or with the events of history, one writer is more accurate than another; one writer is better able to judge of the nature of things and events and of their relations. In inspiration God's action gives the strength necessary to deliver adequately God's message.

God's action on the will of the inspired writer is both physical and moral. Inasmuch as God as the principal Author wills to deliver to men a certain definite message through the instrumentality of the inspired writer, there corresponds to this will of God a charismatic physical motion of the will of the inspired writer which does not deprive it of liberty. The human will—thus moved by God still retains the absolute power to resist. The moral influence of God at times may be a direct command to write as was given to some of the writers. In more instances it will consist in a supernatural illumination of the mind by which it conceives ideas and judgments which impel a man to write.

The delivering of the books to the Church is not an essential of inspiration, but supposes it. We cannot say that God ordained the delivery of the books to the Church as an absolute end in giving inspiration; for some inspired books have been lost. The purpose of inspiration was to deliver a message of salvation to the world, and the ordinary custodian of that message is the Church.

We may distinguish three elements in God's action in inspiration, God supernaturally illumines the intellect to conceive rightly the truths; He moves the will to write faithfully these truths; and he assists the inspired writer to give written expression to these truths without admixture of error.

It is indifferent to inspiration whether the inspired man himself do the material writing or execute it by means of an amanuensis; but in the latter case the assistance of God protects against errors which would affect the sense of the propositions.

The curious question is raised by some: Does inspiration admit of different degrees? as for instance: Is Isaiah more inspired than the writer of the Books of Maccabees? This question must be answered with a distinction. As regards the essence of biblical inspiration all the books are equal, and are received by the Church *pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia*. (Conc. Trid. Sess. 4.) Therefore one book can not be said to be more inspired than another. But since the illumination of the mind and the motion of the will are finite entities they may admit of various degrees of intensity. Of what degree was given we know nothing, since it is not revealed to us. But it is perfectly compatible with the right idea of inspiration that God may have given to one a deeper insight into divine truth, a greater feeling in expressing it, a poetic power in presenting it. These are not of the essence of the inspiration.

CHAPTER II.

EXTENT OF INSPIRATION.

In all these questions we seek first if there be any authoritative teaching on the subject. In the present instance we find that in his universal proposition, "all Scripture is inspired," St. Paul extends inspiration to all Scripture. The same persuasion is in Christ in his use of Scripture. He cites it as a thing of absolute authority: he bases the great proofs of his character and mission on the statement: "It is written." The very fact that a thing is written in Holy Scripture was an absolute proof. The Apostles and other inspired writers did the same. The Fathers are unanimous in asserting that all Scripture is inspired. The councils of the Church have defined this by asserting that all the books with all their parts are inspired.

But now we must see in what sense all Scripture is inspired.

The question of the inspiration of *Obiter Dicta* is a celebrated one in Biblical Criticism. *Obiter Dicta* may be called those details of minor moment related in Holy Writ, which are inserted en passant, not seemingly comprised in the main scope and intention of the writer. The passage in

Tobias XI. 9. relating to the wagging of the tail of Tobias' dog: "blandimento suæ caudæ gaudebat," and the passage in St. Paul's letter to Timothy, II. Tim. IV. 13. relating to the cloak left at Troas: "Penulam, quam reliqui Troade apud Carpum, veniens affer tecum," are usually quoted as examples of *obiter dicta*. Concerning these, two questions may be raised: 1. Are the Obiter Dicta inspired? 2. Is it of faith that these are inspired? Catholic theologians generally answer the first question in the affirmative. And, in truth, such must be defended, for the same danger would menace us as before mentioned, were we to reject the inspiration of these passages, namely, that of gradually widening the circle of these, and inducing uncertainty into the Scripture, by the freedom with which men might reject these details.

Card. Newman asserted that, in his opinion, these were not of faith. Patrizi, quoted by Lamy, and by him followed, does not dare condemn the opinion of those who deny that the Obiter Dicta are of faith. Schmid says: "Credimus doctrinam quam proposuimus quoad illam specialem assertionem, quæ immunitatem ab errore, divinam auctoritatem, et *inspirationem ipsam ad res indifferentes etiam minimas extendit, non esse de fide, et contrariam non esse hæresim*. Nihilominus, persuasum nobis est doctrinam nostram *omnino certam esse, nec contrariam ullo modo probabilem aut tolerabilem judicamus*."

Newman, in the 19th Century for 1884, excludes from the *fide divina credenda* "obiter dicta"; such as, for instance, that Nabuchadnezzar was king of Niniveh, Judith I. 7; or that Paul left his cloak at Troas; or that Tobias' dog wagged his tail. Tob. XI. 9: "And here I am led on to inquire whether *obiter dicta* are conceivable in an inspired document. We know that they are held to exist and even required in treating of the dogmatic utterances of Popes, but are they compatible with inspiration? The common opinion is that they are not. Professor Lamy thus writes about them, in the form of an objection: 'Many minute matters occur in the sacred writers which have regard only to human feebleness and the natural necessities of life, and by no

means require inspiration, since they can otherwise be perfectly well known, and seem scarcely worthy of the Holy Spirit, as for instance, what is said of the dog of Tobias, St. Paul's *penula*, and the salutations at the end of the Epistles.' Neither he nor Fr. Patrizi allow of these exceptions; but Fr. Patrizi, as Lamy quotes him, 'damnare non audet eos qui hæc tenerent', viz., exceptions, and he himself, by keeping silence, seems unable to condemn them either.

By *obiter dicta* in Scripture I also mean such statements as we find in the Book of Judith, that Nabuchodonosor was king of Nineveh. Now it is in favor of there being such unauthoritative *obiter dicta*, that unlike those which occur in dogmatic utterances of Pope and Councils, they are, in Scripture, not doctrinal, but mere unimportant statements of fact; whereas those of Popes and Councils may relate to faith and morals, and are said to be uttered *obiter*, because they are not contained within the scope of the formal definition, and imply no intention of binding the consciences of the faithful. There does not then seem any serious difficulty in admitting their existence in Scripture. Let it be observed, its miracles are doctrinal facts, and in no sense of the phrase can be considered *obiter dicta*."

The Fathers were concurrent in extending inspiration to everything contained in Holy Scripture. "I believe," says St. Augustine, "that no Sacred writer has been deceived in anything." (Epist. 72. ad Hieron.) St. J. Chrys., Hom. XV. in Gen., says that every word is to be pondered, as they are the words of the Holy Ghost (*i. e.* the sense of the words.) So, St. Jerome reproaches, for the same reason, those who do not receive the Epistle to Philemon. St. Thomas, Summa Theol. I. Q. 1. art. 10. ad. 3.: "It is evident that there never can be falsehood contained in the literal sense," and Q. 32. art. 4: "A thing pertains to faith in two ways. In one way, directly, as those things which are principally co-signed to us; as for instance, that God is triune. Things pertain indirectly to faith, from whose contrary would follow something pernicious to faith; as, for instance, if one were to say that Samuel were not the son of Helcana; for from this it would follow that the Scriptures were false."

The encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" in express terms condemns the theory that exempts the *obiter dicta* from, inspiration: "But it is absolutely wrong and forbidden either to narrow inspiration to certain parts only of Holy Scripture, or to admit that the Sacred Writer has erred. For the system of those who, in order to rid themselves of those difficulties, do not hesitate to concede that Divine inspiration regards the things of faith and morals, and nothing beyond, because (as they wrongly think), in a question of the truth or falsehood of a passage, we should consider not so much what God has said as the reason and purpose which He had in mind when saying it—this system cannot be tolerated. For all the Books which the Church receives as sacred and canonical are written wholly and entirely, with all their parts, at the dictation of the Holy Ghost; and so far is it from being possible that any error can co-exist with inspiration, that inspiration not only is essentially incompatible with error, but excludes and rejects it as absolutely and necessarily as it is impossible that God Himself, the Supreme Truth, can utter that which is not true. This is the ancient and unchanging faith of the Church solemnly defined in the councils of Florence and of Trent, and finally confirmed and more expressly formulated by the Council of the Vatican. These are the words of the last: 'The Books of the Old and New Testament, whole and entire, with all their parts, as enumerated by the decree of the same Council (Trent) and in the ancient Latin Vulgate, are to be received as Sacred and Canonical. And the Church holds them as Sacred and Canonical, not because having been composed by human industry, they were afterwards approved by her authority; nor only because they contain revelation without error; but because, having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their Author.' [Sess. III. C. II. *de Rev.*] Hence, because the Holy Ghost employed men as His instruments, we cannot, therefore, say that it was these inspired instruments who, perchance, have fallen into error, and not the primary Author. For, by supernatural power, He so moved and impelled them to write—He was so present to them—that the things which

He ordered, and those only, they first rightly understood, then willed faithfully to write down, and finally expressed in apt words and with infallible truth. Otherwise, it could not be said that He was the Author of the entire Scripture. Such has always been the persuasion of the Fathers. 'Therefore,' says St. Augustine, 'since they wrote the things which He showed and uttered to them, it cannot be pretended that He is not the Writer; for His members executed what their Head dictates.' [*De consensu Evangel.* L. 1, C. 35.] And St. Gregory the Great thus pronounces: 'most superfluous it is to inquire who wrote these things—we loyally believe the Holy Ghost to be the author of the Book. He wrote it who dictated it for writing; He wrote it who inspired its execution.' [*Praef. in Job*, n. 2.]

"It follows that those who maintain that an error is possible in any genuine passage of the Sacred Writings, either pervert the Catholic notion of inspiration, or make God the author of such error."

The error of those who have excluded the *obiter dicta* from inspiration seems to be to regard these details in themselves, without considering their relations to the general text. Considered apart from the other portions of the book, they are unimportant: they could have been omitted without substantial loss to the book. They are not written for their own sake; they are a part of the setting of more important truth. The inspired writer under the influence of inspiration conceives his book in his human mind. It is written in a human manner of expression. These details are not irrelevant; they fit in naturally into the account. The motive moving us to extend inspiration to them is not their own importance; but the fact that if they be denied inspiration the integrity of the Holy Books is assailed. Who shall fix the limits of the *obiter dicta*? Hence they claim inspiration not on account of their own importance but because they are parts of an inspired book. Their claim to inspiration rests on the basic truth that there can not be error in any part of the Bible. The positive teaching of the Church condemns the opinion which asserts that some parts of the Bible are inspired and others are not. The *obiter*

dicta can not be said to be so few as not to form a part as here contemplated. The greater part of the XVI. Chapter of Romans is made up of salutations which are set down as *obiter dicta*.

It seems therefore to follow from the definitions of the Church that inspiration must be extended to all the parts of Holy Scripture.

In answer to the second question, Is it of faith that the *obiter dicta* are inspired? we believe that a negative answer must be returned. Bellarmine, however, holds that it is of faith: "It is heresy, to believe that in St. Paul's Epistles and in other sacred books not all things are written at the dictation of the Holy Ghost; but that some things proceeded solely from human reason and judgment." (De Verbo Dei, Lib. 1.) Melchior Canus (De Locis Theol. Lib. 2, 16) calls the theory an impious error: "How impious is the error to assert that in the canonical books the writers at times wrote as mere men without the divine and supernatural revelation (inspiration), I demonstrate first by the argument that in this opinion the authority of the Holy Scriptures is in great part shaken." He proceeds then to show how easy it were to widen the field of the *obiter dicta*; and then concludes: "Let us therefore confess that everything whether great or small was written by the sacred writers under the dictation of the Holy Ghost."

But the Church has not defined the issue with sufficient clearness to warrant a theological censure of the opposite opinion.

In relation to the inspiration of "*dicta aliorum*," no definite rule can be given. The character of the person, the circumstances in which such saying is uttered, the mode of quoting, and the nature of the proposition must be weighed. For instance, the sayings which the inspired writers make their own by their approbation are inspired. St. Peter was inspired, when he confessed the divinity of Christ, not when he denied Christ. The words of impious men sometimes are quoted, but "in persona illorum," not intending them to be as truths. In regard to these, although no fixed rule can be laid down, still there is no difficulty in distinguishing the true from the false.

Sometimes the statements are formulated as the sayings of others, but are in reality the creations of the author himself. He sometimes expresses the ideas of impious men in order to condemn them. Thus in the book of Wisdom, speeches are placed in the mouths of Epicureans in order to illustrate and condemn these errors.

Again, the inspired writer may reproduce the words of good men and approve them, without thereby extending the prerogative of absolute infallibility to them. Thus in Acts St. Luke relates St. Stephen's great discourse before the Sanhedrim. He declares also that Stephen was filled with the Holy Ghost in his discourse. And yet St. Luke does not become responsible for the lapse of memory whereby Stephen declares that Abraham bought the tomb "for a price in silver of the sons of Hamor in Shechem" (Acts VII. 16). Genesis (XXXIII. 18-19) states that Jacob bought this tomb, and the context warrants the statement of Genesis.

The divine inspiration of Luke aided him faithfully to report Stephen's words. Stephen, though filled with the Holy Ghost, *was not inspired as an inspired writer*. The main truth of his words is not affected by the accidental error. St. Luke approves the substantial truth of Stephen's words.

Again, it may happen that a writer may present his teaching in a species of drama. Care must be taken then to discern when the actors in the drama convey the ideas of the writer of the book. Thus in Job there are various speakers who discuss the great questions of human life and destiny. With consummate art the writer has so conceived the discourses that, though there is an error of fact in Job's friends, inasmuch as they believe him guilty of grave sin, nevertheless they discourse rightly upon the great issues of human life.

If the inspired writer relates the words of others without either implicit or explicit approbation, the words thus related do not become a part of divinely inspired Scripture, but have only their own intrinsic authority. This principle will apply to the letters written to the Jews by the Spartans, and by the Romans, and according to some to the letters

(II. Maccab. I. 15, seqq.; IX. 1 seqq.) written by the Jews to their compatriots in Egypt. In a word therefore, the sayings of others related in Holy Scripture are inspired if they become the *sense* of the inspired writer.

Sometimes the writers express an indetermination of mind, or a state of doubt; or they express an estimate of certain things. St. Luke seems to have been uncertain whether it were eight or ten days that Festus tarried at Jerusalem (Acts XXV. 6); St. John describes the water pots as holding two or three firkins (John II. 6); the number fed by the multiplication of the loaves was not with mathematical precision known to St. Matthew; but it was a number which the correct judgment of men would estimate at five thousand. The truth of history demands nothing more for such a statement. The state of indetermination is not to be ascribed to the Holy Ghost. He uses human instruments to deliver all truth as required by the nature of the things written. It is an inspired fact that Festus tarried at Jerusalem a period of time of which an adequate idea was conveyed by declaring that it was eight or ten days; and so in all other cases. This principle is very useful in its application to such biblical facts as the size of armies, the number of the slain, etc. We must distinguish between these numbers as they came from the inspired writers and the present numbers of the text. Many accidental errors have crept into the present numbers.

It is clear also that opposed to the very nature of inspiration is the theory that the inspired writer may declare a thing which is false in the sense which the human writer intended to convey; but true in the sense that the Holy Ghost delivered thereby. God's action as the principal cause of the writing excludes such a condition in the instrument; for an essential element of inspiration is the illumination of the mind of the inspired writer that he may rightly conceive what he is to write.

It would be the opposite extreme to hold that inspiration banished all ignorance and false persuasion from the mind of the inspired writer. As far as regards the things which they were not called to write as inspired agents

God left them to their own resources; not, of course, excluding that illumining influence that grace works in all the saints. Thus for instance it is clearly proclaimed in revelation that the day of general judgment is hidden from all creatures. This all the inspired writers accepted as a fundamental truth. Yet from their own human reasoning some of them at least seem to have believed that such event was near at hand. This is not in any way prejudicial to inspiration. They do not proclaim that it is near at hand. Perhaps some of their arguments relating to human conduct in a certain sense imply that they believed that the consummation were not far off; but the arguments do not assert it, nor do they become false from the fact that ages have elapsed since they wrote. The uncertainty of that great day is a true incentive to a right order of life; and thus they used it.

A most important and most difficult question is to determine what influence the Holy Ghost has on the words of Holy Scripture. This question is usually treated of under the heading of *Verbal inspiration*. The term *verbal* in this connection is badly chosen; for it admits of such meanings that to the question, Are the Holy Scriptures verbally inspired? we may return an affirmative and negative answer, both true. Hence we have need to present the question in clearer terms.

The words of Holy Scripture may be divided into formal words and material words. The formal words are the mental conceptions of the writer, and corresponds to the ideas expressed in the books. In this sense all the words of Holy Scripture are the words of God; they are all inspired; and are free from error.

The external signs by which these ideas are expressed are conveniently called material words; and the question is now to be discussed: Are these inspired? Here again we must distinguish. All must admit a certain influence of the Holy Ghost on the words. The question therefore narrows itself down to this. In what sense are the material words of Holy Scripture inspired?

We can readily understand that the mental word conceived in the mind in one sense compels and determines the material word; and in another sense leaves it free. For example: the inspired writer under the influence of divine inspiration conceives the idea: The Son of God became man. The nature of human speech limits him to a certain range of words and expressions to convey that idea. But still within that range there is a latitude of freedom. If the writer knows more than one language he may choose one or the other. Thus Matthew had a choice between Hebrew and Greek for his Gospel. We do not deny that God may determine the tongue to be used, but such determination would not be of the essence of inspiration. Again, the writer may express the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity as the Son of God, or the Word of God, and the same freedom of choice is applicable to the predicate.

Let us take as another example the truth: Jesus Christ died for us. A man may express that truth in different material words, viz., The Son of God gave his life for us; The Redeemer suffered death for all mankind, etc.

Now the question to answer is, Did God in inspiration determine the Holy Writers to use one form of expression instead of another, when both were equally apt? Some of the early protestants answered this question in the affirmative. It was a part of that exaggerated sentimentalism which endeavored to set aside the *Magisterium* of the Church, and set up the Scriptures as the sole rule of faith. We have seen that this error died amid its worshippers. In Catholic thought there have been certain changes of thought and certain differences of opinion in those things in which the Church has not defined.

The Fathers at times, speaking oratorically, in their desire to demand for the Scriptures fitting reverence, speak in such terms that without due caution one might be led to believe that they held the theory of absolute inspiration of the material words. But a deeper insight into the consistent principles of the Fathers, and a comparative study of the system of their faith will persuade that what they demanded for the Holy Scriptures was reverence for every

truth of Holy Scripture as it exists clothed in fitting words for us. Though we believe that the inspired writer had a certain liberty in choosing words and expressions, providing they be fitting, when he has made this choice and clothed an inspired idea in words, these words become sacred as signs of a divinely inspired idea, and they will merit the veneration which the Fathers paid them. Moreover, since the writer's intellectual faculties are supernaturally enlightened by the action of inspiration, this illumination will influence the choice of words; the inspired writer will be aided by God to convey his inspired concepts in a manner that befits the infallible message of God; hence our purpose here is not to deny a certain verbal inspiration, but to prevent its exaggeration.

The Fathers used synonymously the two expressions, The Holy Scriptures are inspired by God, and, The Holy Scriptures are dictated by God. Their clear statements demonstrate that they did not use the term dictation to signify the mechanical theory of inspiration. All will consider Origen a capable witness of tradition, the greatest mind of his age. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* VI. 25) transmits to us the following testimony of Origen on the Epistle to the Hebrews:

"That the verbal style of the epistle entitled 'To the Hebrews,' is not rude like the language of the apostle, who acknowledged himself 'rude in speech,' [*II. Cor. XI. 6*] that is, in expression; but that its diction is purer Greek, any one who has the power to discern differences of phraseology will acknowledge. Moreover, that the thoughts of the epistle are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged apostolic writings, any one who carefully examines the apostolic text will admit.

"If I gave my opinion, I should say that the thoughts are those of the apostle, but the diction and phraseology are those of some one who remembered the apostolic teachings, and wrote down at his leisure what had been said by his teacher. Therefore if any church holds that this epistle is by Paul, let it be commended for this. For not without reason have the ancients handed it down as Paul's. But who wrote the epistle, in truth, God knows. The statement

of some who have gone before us is that Clement, bishop of the Romans, wrote the epistle, and of others that Luke, the author of the Gospel and the Acts, wrote it."

We may logically argue that if Origen considered it not inconsistent with inspiration that another should write down the inspired writer's thoughts at his leisure as he remembered them, he was far from holding the absolute inspiration of the material words. At times we find that under the prepossession of his excessive mysticism, Origen extended inspiration to the very material letters of Holy Writ, (Hom. in Ps. I. 4) but he tempered this extreme view by statements such as we have adduced.

St. Ambrose in many things followed the excessive mysticism of Origen. Touching our present theme he says: "Though sometimes, according to the letter, the Evangelists seem at variance, the truths they utter are not discordant, for the mystery is the same." (On Luke X. 171) Again he says (On Luke VIII. 63): "In the Holy Scriptures it is not the order of words but the substance of the things which we should consider."

St. John Chrysostom is sometimes cited as an advocate of inspiration of the material words of Holy Scripture. In his Homily on Genesis, II. 2, he writes thus: "Ye have heard just now the Scripture declaring: 'But for Adam there was not found a help meet for him.' What is the meaning of the brief clause: 'But for Adam?' Why does (the Scripture) place there the conjunction (*ὁ*)? Did it not suffice to say: 'For Adam?' It is not from vain curiosity that we discuss these things, but that by interpreting all things we may teach you not to pass over any brief saying, or even syllable of Holy Scripture. For they are not mere words, but the words of the Holy Ghost, and therefore a great value may be found in one syllable." Again in the same work, XXI. 1, he continues: "In the Holy Scriptures there is nothing written which has not a great wealth of meaning; for since the prophets spoke by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, therefore the writings proceeding from the Holy Ghost contain in themselves a great treasure. There is not a syllable or tittle in Holy Scripture in whose depths

there is not a great treasure." In his Homily on "Salute Priscilla and Aquila," Chrysostom declares the purpose of his homily to be "that ye may know that in the Holy Scriptures there is nothing superfluous, even though it be an iota or a tittle. And even a simple salutation opens up to us a vast sea of meaning. And why do I say, a simple salutation? often even the addition of one letter adds the value of sentences. This may be seen in the name of Abraham. A man who receives a letter from a friend, not only reads the body of the letter, but also the salutation at the end, and concludes from it the writer's affection; and since Paul, or rather not Paul, but the grace of the Holy Ghost, dictates a letter to a whole city, and a numerous people and through them to the whole world, is it not most unbecoming to judge that any thing therein is superfluous and pass it by, not realizing that thus everything is perverted?"

This is a strong patristic argument for the inspiration of the *obiter dicta*, but it does not maintain the absolute inspiration of the material words. In the first place if we press the testimony too much it becomes absurd, and we are unwilling to believe that the mighty mind of Chrysostom should have so betrayed him. He well knew that the material words of the Old Testament were not the material words of the inspired writer, but the words of an interpreter, and as Ambrose rightly says: "We must always seek the sense, which the frequent translations from Hebrew into Greek, and from Greek into Latin attenuates." (On Ps. XXXVII. 49).

Chrysostom himself admits the same principle: "We have not the Old Testament writ in our mother tongue: it was composed in one tongue; we read it in another. It was first written in Hebrew; we have received it in Greek. By its translation into another tongue it becomes difficult. All who are versed in many tongues know that it is impossible with equal clearness to translate everything from its own language into another. This is a cause of difficulty in the Old Testament." (On The Obscurity of Proph. II. 2.) Therefore the letters and tittles of the Greek text could not

have been considered by Chrysostom as dictated by the Holy Ghost. St. Chrysostom's meaning is therefore that the deep *sense* of Holy Scripture is to be sought in every word of Holy Scripture. Acting within that range of liberty that we have explained the writers chose certain words and expressions as the sensible signs to convey their inspired ideas. Therefore the ideas which might have been expressed in other ideas, *de facto* lie in these words. We may therefore call these words inspired; for by them as sensible signs the conceptions of inspired minds are delivered to us. The words therefore merit all reverence, and we can not come at the deep sense of Holy Scripture without weighing every word. The conjunction in Genesis specified by Chrysostom has a value, for it makes more forcible the contrast between the completeness of the other orders of creation, and the incompleteness of the human race as existing in Adam. We must also know that Chrysostom spoke oratorically, and used the arts of oratory. In other works he distinguishes between the inspired sense and the material word. In his work *Contra Judæos* II. XLVIII. he says: "When thou hearest Paul crying out and saying: 'behold, I Paul say to you, if you be circumcised, Christ profits you nothing,' the voice, *φωνή*, only recognize to be that of Paul, but the sense and the dogma recognize to be of Christ by whom he was interiorly taught."

St. Jerome is most reverent to the "syllables, tittles, points, etc." of Holy Scripture, since they "are of divine origin and full of meaning," (*On Eph. V. 6*). Again he declares: "For I myself not only admit but freely proclaim that in translating from the Greek, *except in the case of Holy Scriptures, where even the order of the words is a mystery*, I render sense for sense, and not word for word." (*Epist. LVII. 4.*)

A superficial observation of such passages might move one to believe that Jerome asserted the mechanical theory of verbal inspiration; but deeper study of his works demonstrates that he allowed to the human writers the same range of liberty in the use of words and expressions for which we are pleading. In his commentary on the well

known hyperbaton of Ephesians, III. 1, Jerome declares: "I believe that the expression here is defective." Jerome could not attribute a defective expression to the Holy Ghost. Again St. Jerome in his CXX. Epistle, 11, has this testimony: "Though he (Paul) had knowledge of all the Scriptures, and knew many tongues, he was unable to render the august *sense* of the Holy Scriptures fittingly in Greek. He had therefore Titus as an interpreter, as Peter had Mark, whose Gospel was composed by Peter's dictation and Mark's writing. Moreover the two epistles which are called Peter's differ in style, character, and composition of words. From which we know that by the necessity of the case, Peter used different amanuenses." Jerome will not be said to have held that God inspired thoughts to Paul and Peter, and words to different interpreters who wrote their thoughts.

Jerome traces a man's origin and education in his inspired writings: "We must know that Isaiah is eloquent in speech, being a man of noble birth and of cultured eloquence, and free from everything uncouth." (Prof. on Is.) "Jeremiah the prophet is held by the Hebrew to be ruder in speech than Isaiah and Hosea and other prophets, but he equals them *in sense*, for he prophesied in the same spirit. The plainness of his language comes from the place of his birth. He was of Anathoth, a village to this day, three miles distant from Jerusalem." (Prol. On Jer.) "Amos the prophet was of the shepherds, unskilled in speech, but not in knowledge; for the same Spirit who spoke by all the prophets spoke by him." (Prol. On Amos.) This is a clear argument that the Holy Ghost delivered the sense of the Holy Scriptures through men, leaving to them to employ words and expressions in conformity with their education.

A strong argument against the theory of the inspiration of the material words is the fact that the inspired writers of the New Testament, when quoting from the Old Testament do not quote the exact words, but only the sense. Now if the material words were inspired by the Holy Ghost, they would have taken care to reproduce them. Jerome develops this argument at great length: "In Matthew [XXVII. 9, 10.] when the thirty pieces of silver are returned

by the traitor Judas, and the potter's field is purchased with them, it is written:—"Then was fulfilled that which was spoken of by Jeremiah the prophet, saying, 'and they took the thirty pieces of silver the price of him that was valued which they of the children of Israel did value, and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.' This passage is not found in Jeremiah at all but in Zechariah, in quite different words and an altogether different order. In fact the Vulgate renders it as follows:— 'And I will say unto them, If it is good in your sight, give ye me a price or refuse it. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And the Lord said unto me, Put them into the melting furnace and consider if it is tried as I have been tried by them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver and cast them into the house of the Lord.' [Zech. XI. 12, 13, Vulg.] It is evident that the rendering of the Septuagint differs widely from the quotation of the evangelist. In the Hebrew also, though the sense is the same, the words are quite different and differently arranged. It says: 'And I said unto them, If ye think good, give me my price; and, if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the potter; [statuarius.] a goodly price that I was priced at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord.' [Zech. XI. 12, 13.]

They may accuse the apostle of falsifying his version seeing that it agrees neither with the Hebrew nor with the translators of the Septuagint: and worse than this, they may say that he has mistaken the author's name putting down Jeremiah when it should be Zechariah. Far be it from us to speak thus of a follower [peditsequus.] of Christ, who made it his care to formulate dogmas rather than to hunt for words and syllables. To take another instance from Zechariah, the evangelist John quotes from the Hebrew, 'They shall look on him whom they pierced,' [Joh. XIX. 37: Zech. XII. 10] for which we read in the Septuagint 'And they shall look upon me because they have mocked me,' and in the Latin version, 'And they shall look upon me for the things which they have mocked or insulted.' Here

the evangelist, the Septuagint, and our own version [*i. e.* the Italic, for the Vulgate, which was not then published, accurately represents the Hebrew.] all differ; yet the divergence of language is atoned by oneness of spirit. In Matthew again we read of the Lord preaching flight to the apostles and confirming His counsel with a passage from Zechariah. 'It is written,' he says, 'I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.' [Matt. XXVI, 31; Zech. XIII. 7.] But in the Septuagint and in the Hebrew it reads differently, for it is not God who speaks, as the evangelist makes out, but the prophet who appeals to God the Father saying:—'Smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered.' In this instance according to my judgment—and I have some careful critics with me—the evangelist is guilty of a fault in presuming to ascribe to God what are the words of the prophet. Again the same evangelist writes that at the warning of an angel Joseph took the young child and his mother and went into Egypt and remained there till the death of Herod; 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son.' [Matt. II. 13–15.] The Latin manuscripts do not so give the passage, but in Hosea [Hos. XI. 1.] the true Hebrew text has the following:—'When Israel was a child then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt.' Which the Septuagint renders thus:—'When Israel was a child then I loved him, and called his sons out of Egypt. 'Are they [*i. e.*, the Septuagint and Vulgate versions] altogether to be rejected because they have given another turn to a passage which refers primarily to the mystery of Christ? . . . Once more it is written in the pages of the same evangelist, 'And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene.' [Matt. II. 23.] Let those word fanciers and nice critics of all composition tell us where they have read the words; and if they cannot, let me tell them that they are in Isaiah. [Isa. XI. 1.] For in the place where we read and translate, 'There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots,' [So AV.; the Vulg.

varies slightly.] in the Hebrew idiom it is written thus, "There shall come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse, and a Nazarene shall grow from his root.' How can the Septuagint leave out the word 'Nazarene,' if it is unlawful to substitute one word for another? It is sacrilege either to conceal or to set at naught a mystery.

"Let us pass on to other passages, for the brief limits of a letter do not suffer us to dwell too long on any one point. The same Matthew says:—'Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son and they shall call his name Emmanuel.' [Matt. I. 22, 23; Isa. VII. 14.] The rendering of the Septuagint is, 'Behold a virgin shall receive seed and shall bring forth a son, and ye shall call his name Emmanuel.' If people cavil at words, obviously 'to receive seed' is not the exact equivalent of 'to be with child,' and 'ye shall call' differs from 'they shall call.' Moreover in the Hebrew we read thus, 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son and shall call his name Immanuel.' [AV.] Ahaz shall not call him so, for he was convicted of want of faith, nor the Jews, for they were destined to deny him, but she who is to conceive him, and bear him, the virgin herself. In the same evangelist we read that Herod was troubled at the coming of the Magi, and that gathering together the scribes and the priests he demanded of them where Christ should be born, and that they answered him, 'In Bethlehem of Judah: for thus it is written by the prophet; and thou Bethlehem in the land of Judah art not the least among the princes of Judah, for out of thee shall come a governor that shall rule my people Israel.' [Matt. II. 5., 6.] In the Vulgate [*i. e.* the Versio Itala which was vulgata or 'commonly used at this time, as Jerome's Version was afterwards] this passage appears as follows:—'And thou Bethlehem, the house of Ephratah, art small to be among the thousands of Judah, yet one shall come out of thee for me to be a prince in Israel.' You will be more surprised still at the difference in words and order between Matthew and the Septuagint if you look at the Hebrew which runs thus:—'But thou Bethlehem

Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel.' [Mic. V. 2.] Consider one by one the words of the evangelist:—'And thou Bethlehem in the land of Judah.' For the land of Judah the Hebrew has 'Ephratah' while the Septuagint gives 'the house of Ephratah.' The evangelist writes, 'art not the least among the princes of Judah.' In the Septuagint this is, 'art small to be among the thousands of Judah,' while the Hebrew gives, 'though thou be little among the thousands of Judah.' There is a contradiction here—and that not merely verbal—between the evangelist and the prophet; for in this place at any rate both Septuagint and Hebrew agree. The evangelist says that he is not little among the princes of Judah, while the passage from which he quotes says exactly the opposite of this, 'Thou are small indeed and little; but yet out of thee, small and little as thou art, there shall come forth for me a leader in Israel,' a sentiment in harmony with that of the apostle, 'God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty.' [I. Cor. I. 27.] Moreover the last clause 'to rule' or 'to feed my people Israel' clearly runs differently in the original.

"I refer to these passages, not to convict the evangelists of falsification—a charge worthy only of impious men like Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian—but to bring home to my critics their own want of knowledge, and to gain from them such consideration that they may concede to me in the case of a simple letter what, whether they like it or not, they will have to concede to the Apostles in the Holy Scriptures. Mark, the disciple of Peter, begins his gospel thus:—'The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, as it is written in the prophet Isaiah: Behold I send my messenger before thy face who shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.' [Mark I. 1-3.] This quotation is made up from two prophets, Malachi, that is to say, and Isaiah. For the first part: 'Behold I send my messenger before thy face who shall prepare thy way before thee,' occurs at the close of Malachi. [Mal. III. 1]

But the second part: 'The voice of one crying, etc.,' we read in Isaiah. [Isa. XL. 3.] On what grounds then has Mark in the very beginning of his book set the words: 'As it is written in the prophet Isaiah, Behold I send my messenger,' when, as we have said, it is not written in Isaiah at all, but in Malachi the last of the twelve prophets? Let ignorant presumption solve this nice question if it can, and I will ask pardon for being in the wrong. The same Mark brings before us the Saviour thus addressing the Pharisees: 'Have ye never read what David did when he had need and was hungry, he and they that were with him, how he went into the house of God in the days of Abiathar the highpriest, and did eat the shewbread which is not lawful to eat but for the priests?' [Mark II. 25, 26.] Now let us turn to the books of Samuel, or, as they are commonly called, of Kings, and we shall find there that the highpriest's name was not Abiathar but Ahimelech, [I. Sam. XXI. 1.] the same that was afterwards put to death with the rest of the priests by Doeg at the command of Saul. [I. Sam. XXII. 16-18.] Let us pass on now to the apostle Paul who writes thus to the Corinthians: 'For had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But, as it is written, Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him.' [I. Cor. II. 8, 9.] Some writers on this passage betake themselves to the ravings of the apocryphal books, and assert that the quotation comes from the Revelation of Eliah; [This book is no longer extant. It belonged to the same class as the Book of Enoch.] whereas the truth is that it is found in Isaiah according to the Hebrew text: 'Since the beginning of the world men have not heard nor perceived by the ear, neither hath the eye seen, O God, beside thee what thou hast prepared for them that wait for thee.' [Isa. LXIV. 4, LXX. AV. has 'what he hath prepared for him that waiteth for him.'] The Septuagint has rendered the words quite differently: 'Since the beginning of the world we have not heard, neither have our eyes seen any God beside thee and thy true works, and thou wilt shew mercy to them that wait for thee.' We see then from what

place the quotation is taken and yet the apostle has not rendered his original word for word, but, using a paraphrase, he has given the sense in different terms. In his epistle to the Romans the same apostle quotes these words from Isaiah: 'Behold I lay in Sion a stumbling stone and rock of offence,' [Rom. IX. 33.] a rendering which is at variance with the Greek version [Lit. with the old version.] yet agrees with the original Hebrew. The Septuagint gives an opposite meaning, 'that you fall not on a stumblingstone nor on a rock of offence.' The apostle Peter agrees with Paul and the Hebrew, writing: 'but to them that do not believe, a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence.' [I Pet. II. 8; AV. is different.] From all these passages it is clear that the apostles and evangelists in translating the old testament scriptures have sought to give the meaning rather than the words, and that they have not greatly cared to preserve forms or constructions, so long as they could make clear the subject to the understanding.

"Luke the evangelist and companion of apostles describes Christ's first martyr Stephen as relating what follows in a Jewish assembly. 'With threescore and fifteen souls Jacob went down into Egypt, and died himself, and our fathers were carried over [So the Vulg.: AV. punctuates differently.] into Sychem, and laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money of the sons of Emmor [*i. e.* Hamor] the father of Sychem.' [Acts VII. 15, 16.] In Genesis this passage is quite differently given, for it is Abraham that buys of Ephron the Hittite, the son of Zohar, near Hebron, for four hundred shekels [Drachmæ.] of silver, a double cave, [Spelunca duplex.] and the field that is about it, and that buries in it Sarah his wife. And in the same book we read that, after his return from Mesopotamia with his wives and his sons, Jacob pitched his tent before Salem a city of Shechem which is in the land of Canaan, and that he dwelt there and 'bought a parcel of a field where he had spread his tent at the hand of Hamor, the father of Sychem, for an hundred lambs' [AV. marg.], and that 'he erected there an altar and called there upon the God of Israel.' [Gen. XXXIII. 18-20; AV. varies slightly.] Abraham does

not buy the cave from Hamor the father of Sychem, but from Ephron the son of Zohar, and he is not buried in Sychem but in Hebron which is corruptly called Arboch. Whereas the twelve patriarchs are not buried in Arboch but in Sychem in the field purchased not by Abraham but by Jacob. I postpone the solution of this delicate problem to enable those who cavil at me to search and see that in dealing with the scriptures it is the sense we have to look to and not the words."

None of the Fathers treated the question of verbal inspiration with the clearness and depth of Augustine. He distinguishes between sense and material word, and declares that in employing the material word, the writers use that liberty that we here demand for them. A good specimen of St. Augustine's principles concerning this question is found in his "Harmony of the Evangelists," Bk. II., 27-29:

"If now the question is asked, as to which of the words we are to suppose the most likely to have been the precise words used by John the Baptist, whether those recorded as spoken by him in Matthew's Gospel, or those in Luke's, or those which Mark has introduced, among the few sentences which he mentions to have been uttered by him, while he omits notice of all the rest, it will not be deemed worth while creating any difficulty for oneself in a matter of that kind, by any one who wisely understands that the real requisite in order to get at the knowledge of the truth is just to make sure of the things really meant, whatever may be the precise words in which they happen to be expressed. For although one writer may retain a certain order in the words, and another present a different one, there is surely no real contradiction in that. Nor, again, need there be any antagonism between the two, although one may state what another omits. For it is evident that the evangelists have set forth these matters just in accordance with the recollection each retained of them, and just according as their several predilections prompted them to employ greater brevity or richer detail on certain points, while giving, nevertheless, the same account of the subjects themselves.

“Thus, too, in what more pertinently concerns the matter in hand, it is sufficiently obvious that, since the truth of the Gospel, conveyed in that word of God which abides eternal and unchangeable above all that is created, but which at the same time has been disseminated throughout the world by the instrumentality of temporal symbols, and by the tongues of men, has possessed itself of the most exalted height of authority, we ought not to suppose that any one of the writers is giving an unreliable account, if, when several persons are recalling some matter either heard or seen by them, they fail to follow the very same plan, or to use the very same words, while describing, nevertheless, the self-same fact. Neither should we indulge such a supposition, although the order of the words may be varied; or although some words may be substituted in place of others, which nevertheless have the same meaning; or although something may be left unsaid, either because it has not occurred to the mind of the recorder, or because it becomes readily intelligible from other statements which are given; or although, among other matters which (may not bear directly on his immediate purpose, but which) he decides on mentioning rather for the sake of the narrative, and in order to preserve the proper order of time, one of them may introduce something which he does not feel called upon to expound as a whole at length, but only to touch upon in part; or although, with the view of illustrating his meaning, and making it thoroughly clear, the person to whom authority is given to compose the narrative makes some additions of his own, not indeed in the subject-matter itself, but in the words by which it is expressed; or although, while retaining a perfectly reliable comprehension of the fact itself, he may not be entirely successful, however he may make that his aim, in calling to mind and reciting anew with the most literal accuracy the very words which he heard on the occasion. Moreover, if any one affirms that the evangelists ought certainly to have had that kind of capacity imparted to them by the power of the Holy Spirit, which would secure them against all variation the one from the other, either in the kind of words, or in their order, or in their number, that

person fails to perceive, that just in proportion as the authority of the evangelists [under their existing conditions] is made pre-eminent, the credit of all other men who offer true statements of events ought to have been established on a stronger basis by their instrumentality: so that when several parties happen to narrate the same circumstance, none of them can by any means be rightly charged with untruthfulness if he differs from the other only in such a way as can be defended on the ground of the antecedent example of the evangelists themselves. For as we are not at liberty either to suppose or to say that any one of the evangelists has stated what is false, so it will be apparent that any other writer is as little chargeable with untruth, with whom, in the process of recalling anything for narration, it has fared only in a way similar to that in which it is shown to have fared with those evangelists. And thus as it belongs to the highest morality to guard against all that is false, so ought we all the more to be ruled by an authority so eminent, to the effect that we should not suppose ourselves to come upon what must be false, when we find the narratives of any writers differ from each other in the manner in which the records of the evangelists are proved to contain variations. At the same time, in what most seriously concerns the faithfulness of doctrinal teaching, we should also understand that it is not so much truth in mere words as rather truth in the facts themselves, that is to be sought and embraced; for as to writers who do not employ precisely the same modes of statement, if they only do not present discrepancies with respect to the facts and the sentiments themselves, we accept them as holding the same position in veracity.

“With respect, then, to those comparisons which I have instituted between the several narratives of the evangelists, what do these present that must be considered to be of a contradictory order? Are we to regard in this light the circumstance that one of them has given us the words, *whose shoes I am not worthy to bear*, whereas the others speak of the *unloosing of the latchet of the shoe*? For here, indeed, the difference seems to be neither in the mere words, nor in the order of the words, nor in any matter of simple phrase-

ology, but in the actual matter of fact, when in one case the *bearing of the shoe* is mentioned and in the other the *unloosing of the shoe's latchet*. Quite fairly, therefore, may the question be put, as to what it was that John declared himself unworthy to do—whether to bear the shoes, or to unloose the shoe's latchet. For if only the one of these two sentences was uttered by him, then that evangelist will appear to have given the correct narrative who was in a position to record what was said; while the writer who has given the saying in another form, although he may not indeed have offered an [intentionally] false account of it, may at any rate be taken to have made a slip of memory, and will be reckoned thus to have stated one thing instead of another. It is only seemly, however, that no charge of absolute untruth should be laid against the evangelists, and that, too, not only with regard to that kind of untruth which comes by the positive telling of what is false, but also with regard to that which arises through forgetfulness. Therefore, if it is pertinent to the matter to deduce one sense from the words *to bear the shoes*, and another sense from the words *to unloose the shoe's latchet*, what should one suppose the correct interpretation to be put on the facts, but that John did give utterance to both these sentences, either on two different occasions or in one and the same connection? For he might very well have expressed himself thus, *whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose, and whose shoes I am not worthy to bear*: and then one of the evangelists may have reproduced the one portion of the saying, and the rest of them the other; while, notwithstanding this, all of them have really given a truthful narrative. But further, if, when he spoke of the shoes of the Lord, John meant nothing more than to convey the idea of His supremacy and his own lowliness, then, whichever of the two sayings may have actually been uttered by him, whether that regarding the unloosing of the latchet of the shoes, or that respecting the bearing of the shoes, the self-same sense is still correctly preserved by any writer who, while making mention of the shoes in words of his own, has expressed at the same time the same idea of lowliness, and thus has not made any de-

parture from the real mind [of the person of whom he writes]. It is therefore a useful principle, and one particularly worthy of being borne in mind, when we are speaking of the concord of the evangelists, that there is no divergence [to be supposed] from truth, even when they introduce some saying different from what was actually uttered by the person concerning whom the narrative is given, provided that, notwithstanding this, they set forth as his mind precisely what is also so conveyed by that one among them who reproduces the words as they were literally spoken. For thus we learn the salutary lesson, that our aim should be nothing else than to ascertain what is the mind and intention of the person who speaks."

In view of this clear testimony, it is strange that Père Lagrange hesitates not to say: "That we maintain, *with the Fathers*, that inspiration extends itself to everything, even to the words, is precisely to the end to establish that the term inspiration is not synonymous with the dictation" (*Revue Biblique*, 1904, p. 293). While such reckless disregard of historical facts and such party spirit prevail in those who demand a more liberal exegesis, there is no hope of effecting a harmony among Catholic scholars. Far more truthful is the doctrine which Venerable Bede drew from the Fathers, that the prophets "secretly were taught the mysteries by clear mental visions, that they might make these things known to their hearers by whatever words they pleased". (On II. Peter 1.)

Most of the older scholastic writers did not expressly treat the question of verbal inspiration. St. Thomas leaves men in doubt as to his view. However, in his prologue to Hebrews, he declares that in this epistle Paul "is more elegant in style, because although he knew all tongues (I. Cor. XIV. 18) nevertheless, he knew better the Hebrew as his mother tongue in which he wrote this epistle. And therefore he could speak more eloquently in that tongue than in another. . . . Luke, a most excellent interpreter, transferred that eloquence from Hebrew into Greek." This certainly admits the human element in the words of Scripture for which we are contending.

Henry of Ghent, a disciple of Albertus Magnus, asserted verbal inspiration, but no other writer of authority is found of that opinion among the older scholastics.

After the Council of Trent opinion was divided on the question. Towards the end of the XVIII. Century, the opinion denying verbal inspiration in the material sense became the common opinion. Marchini (†1773) expresses the common opinion of his day as follows: "The divine afflatus and inspiration can have place even though God by special action furnishes neither words nor sentences. Truly if the Holy Ghost is present to the writer whom he has moved to write; if, in case memory should fail the writer, (the Holy Ghost) opportunely suggests what he wishes written; if he enlightens the mind with a light that dispels all ignorance and lack of judgment; if he strengthens the mind with such power that all things are written faithfully, plainly and consistently; if he brings to the mind hidden, sublime, and unknown things; if he leaves no part of Scripture devoid of his care, verily the books will be written by the inspiration of God, although the speech, and the expressions proceed for the most part from the genius, memory, study, meditation, and diligence of man." (De Div. et Can. Sac. Lib.)

The sense and the words are the effect of a man writing under the influence of divine inspiration, and in that sense the words are influenced by divine inspiration; but this influence leaves to the writer more of the human element in the words than in the sense; for the sense is the direct object of God's action: the words are intended only as a means of conveying the sense. God as the principal author can not be indifferent as to the sense of any part of Holy Scripture, for the sense of every part is attributable to Him. He may and does permit a liberty of choice of words to convey this sense, provided they be an apt medium to express his mind. God inspired writers in order that they should write determinate truths, not determinate words; he inspired them to write his message in fitting words which their faculties furnished.

There are times when the Holy Ghost determines the material words, but this pertains not to the essence of

inspiration, and more rarely is verified. Again when God gives command to "speak the words" of God, or to "write the words of God" it is evident that the meaning is to deliver to men the formal words of God, not the material words.

A legitimate argument against the inspiration of the material words of Scripture may be drawn from the following consideration. In God's plan entities are not to be multiplied without necessity. God employs the ordinary course of created agents where their causality is adequate to attain the end. Now there is no reason why God should have exercised a special action in determining words and expressions for the inspired writers. That God could have thus acted on the inspired writers, all admit. It may be that he did determine the very material words in some instances; but the evidence is against admitting that such determination pertains to the essence of inspiration. Many of the arguments against verbal inspiration have already been adduced. An additional argument may be drawn from the manner in which the inspired writers record facts.

In the Scriptures, sometimes the same fact is related by different writers in different ways. For instance, the consecration of the chalice is related in four different ways by St. Matt., XXVI., 28; St. Mark, XIV., 24; St. Luke, XXII., 20, and St. Paul, I. Cor. XI., 25. These speak of the same words of Christ, as He used them once for all at the Last Supper. If the Holy Ghost had inspired the words, how could we account for these divergencies? Here applies aptly what St. Augustine said of the inspired writers: "*Ut quisque meminerat eos explicasse manifestum est.*"

We may add that certainly the determination of the material words can not enter into the essence of the message of God, for such message was destined for the whole world, which it did not reach, and could not reach in the original words in which it was first delivered.

It may be said that the same argument evinces the same latitude for the things of Scripture that pertain not to faith and morals. In the versions accidental errors have crept into these in more or less degree; therefore, why demand a more absolute standard of inerrancy in the original? To

answer this difficulty we must know that the conditions of the sense of Holy Scripture differ from the conditions of the words. It is defined by the Church that God is the Author of the entire Scriptures with all their parts, for the reason that they were written by men inspired by the Holy Ghost. This definition extends inspiration to every enunciation of Holy Scripture, and the definition goes farther, and declares that the whole Scriptures thus inspired contain no error. Now if we exempt certain passages of Holy Writ from this infallible inspiration, we sever the vital unity of the Scriptures, we practise vivisection in the strict sense. A proposition may be enunciated in different words, and still preserve its identity of sense; but a sentence can not be true and false at the same time. When we say that inspired writers wrote the message of God with infallible truth, but with words which they themselves determined within the range of fitting words, we leave to God his rightful character as Inspirer and Author of the Scriptures; but when we say that the inspired writers wrote partly true things and partly false, we can not make God the Author of such a medley of truth and falsehood. The divine action of inspiration enlightens the mind of the writer to conceive ideas of the truths he is to deliver. These concepts must be true. Truth is one. But without detriment to their truth these concepts may in general be expressed by different words. They demand apt words, but not determinate forms of expression; and here we place the liberty of the inspired writer. When Abraham goes down with his wife Sarah into Egypt, and she is taken from him into the house of Pharaoh, there is but one concept that corresponds to it. It may be expressed in different words, but the event has an individual unity, and there can be but one true idea of it. Therefore when the writer records that event, he must reproduce that determinate fact. Therefore when we find such historical statements in the Bible we must conclude that they are historically true. They cannot be allegories, or parables: all the characteristics of allegory and parable are absent. They form a part of a real history; their context shows that the writers meant them as real history.

If we characterize them as myth and folk-lore, we impeach the veracity of the word of God.

The reasonableness of the doctrine just enunciated can be seen from a commonplace example. A professor delivers his lecture to his hearers, and they commit the sense of his discourse to writing, each in a different manner. Provided they relate faithfully the sense of what he says they may all be said to have his lecture; though the words differ, the sense remains the same, and the sense is the proper result of inspiration.

In the latter part of the last century a new theory was proposed regarding verbal inspiration. The advocates of the new theory refuse to admit that God's inspiring act affected the ideas differently from the words. They extend the act of inspiration to the sense and the words. They depart from the cruder mechanical theory of verbal inspiration, and raise the question more into the psychological order. But among the advocates of this new view of verbal inspiration there is not a consensus. Some of them in substance are in accord with the views which we here defend. It is in many cases merely a question of terms. We admit an influence of God on the words; and the words of Scripture are inspired words, because they are the signs of inspired ideas. We do not say that God is the Author of the ideas, and man is the author of the words; because the inspired writer was under the influence of inspiration when he wrote the words, and the action of God upon his faculties is reflected in the words he employed; but we believe that God's action left to man to use his faculties in expressing the conceptions of his mind, even while he remained under the influence of inspiration. Hence, as Jerome says, Paul may have used a defective expression in Ephesians, though the expression can at no time be so defective as not to convey God's meaning..

Lagrange, though an advocate of verbal inspiration, is obliged to admit that the action of God does not affect the words in the same manner as the sense: "Without doubt between the thought and the word there exists an intrinsic difference; therefore inspiration does not affect them in the

same manner. The thought should be true, the word should be apt; therefore under the influence of the divine light the judgment will be true, the terms and other accessories will be fittingly chosen. If this is what certain modern writers mean in distinguishing between inspiration for the thoughts and assistance for the words we are substantially in accord with them." (Revue Biblique, 1896, p. 215.) •

It would seem at first sight that there were no substantial difference of opinion between the advocates of the new exegesis and us on the subject of inspiration, but in reality one of the fundamental tenets of their system lies here. While they grant to the inspired author the same liberty that we grant him, they insist that his material words be still termed inspired. They do this for the purpose of demanding the same liberty of the human element in the thoughts themselves. Thus Lagrange proposes the system: "It would be unreasonable to say that God in the same manner wills the thoughts and the words, that he attaches the same importance to the words as to the thoughts, or inspires both in the same manner. We do not wish to be narrower than Franzelin, but broader. He abandoned the theory that the words were the (material) words of God, because he found it difficult to find in them the perfection of things immediately revealed. We demand the same liberty for the thoughts, and it is scarcely exact to call them (the thoughts) *sensa Dei*, an expression which easily might become exclusive" (Revue Biblique, 1904, p. 294). The argument here is most illogical and inconsistent. If, by his own admission, the thoughts are more important than the words; if inspiration affects them differently, how can he demand the same liberty for the thoughts as Franzelin demands for the words?

In his work, (Die Schriftinspiration, 1891), Dr. Dausch declared: "To separate inspired elements from non-inspired elements of Holy Writ is like the distinction between verbal inspiration and sense inspiration, more or less a vivisection of the living efficacy of the Spirit." This phrase has been adopted by many to support the theory of verbal

inspiration. Without doubt to remove the influence of God entirely from the actual words of Holy Scripture might be called vivisection; but that term can not apply to the theory which we have defended. We believe therefore that inspired thoughts influence the words by which, with God's assistance, they are expressed; we believe that the supernatural enlightenment of the mind favorably reacts upon the power of expression; we believe that God assisted the writers so that infallible truth was competently expressed; but we believe at the same time that the writers exercised a certain liberty in the choice of words and expressions; that they reveal their genius and education in these; that certain literary defects are found in the words; and that certain things might have been better expressed. We believe also that the action of God is directed, as to its more immediate object, to the sense of Holy Scripture; and consequently the human element is greater in the words than in the thoughts.

The authoritative teaching of the Catholic Church proclaims the Scriptures to be God's infallible word, and consequently free from error. It is clear that it is the mind of the Church to make the inerrancy of the Scriptures the effect of its inspired character, to derive it from God's authorship. If a man denies the infallibility of Holy Scripture in things of faith and morals he is a heretic: if he limits the inerrancy of Holy Scripture to things of faith and morals only he is not far from being a heretic. Of course this applies to the Scriptures as they came from the inspired writers; and to the versions in the measure that they are authentic. The definition of the Council of Trent guarantees that the Vulgate is authentic in things of faith and morals.

While all Scripture is true, all Scripture is not true in the same way. The sense that the Scriptures affirm is always true. The parable and allegory are not true as history, because they are not written as history. They are true as moral illustrations, because their sense is a moral illustration. That which is written as parable is true as parable; that which is written as poetry is true as poetry; that which is written as allegory is true as allegory; that which is written as history is true as history; and that which is written

as doctrinal or moral teaching is a true law of belief and conduct. For this cause the historical method of Lagrange is rejected, because it makes a congeries of folk-lore, legends, and myths that which is written as history.

There may be times when it is difficult to discern that which is strictly historical from that which is fictitious history. Such difficulty will never obscure the way of belief or conduct. Some believe that Tobias or Judith or Ruth is a fictitious history. The Church has not defined the question. To deal with it, one must examine the evidence, and see whether the object of the writer be to write real or fictitious history. The object of the writer is always to write the truth; his fictitious history is not less true than his real history: it is true in the sense proper to its nature as a genus of literature which the Holy Scripture can use. It inculcates principles of truth and duty by concrete examples. While conservative opinion holds that Job is a historical personage, the great drama of the Book of Job is largely a creation of the poet's inspired mind to illustrate infallibly true principles. Hence in judging of an inspired book, we must have regard to its character to determine in what sense it is true. Prophecy has its peculiar character, its visions and its symbols; poetry has its poetic flights of imagination; parable and allegory make fictitious entities act and speak their message; while real history declares its message by relating facts. There is no place in Scripture for folk-lore or myth, for these relate the legends of a people as real history.

We must realize also that inspiration is only a partial participation of the divine light. God does not speak to us in the Scriptures *more divino*, but in a human manner. He condescends to us as we condescend to address a child. The books therefore of Holy Scripture contain the evidences of imperfection due to their human origin; but God's inspiration moves the writers to write nothing but the truth. The writers were not *critical historians*; but the Spirit of God supplied where human knowledge failed.

Another important hermeneutical principle is that the sense of an inspired writer may have a wider range than he

comprehends. That which he means to utter is the sense of God, but that very sense may be greater than he comprehends. This principle was clearly admitted by the Fathers: "Perhaps not even St. John spoke (of the Word) as it is, but as he, being a man, was able; because he, a man, spoke of God, he was verily inspired but still a man. . . . Therefore being a man inspired, he uttered not all; but what he could, being a man." (Aug. On John I., 1.) St. Jerome (On Eph. III., 5) admits that the mystery of the incarnation "was not known to the patriarchs and prophets as it is now known to the apostles and saints: it is one thing to know future things in a vision; it is another thing to contemplate them now fulfilled." St. Thomas sums up the question in his usual clear way: "We must know that since the mind of the prophet is an imperfect instrument, even the true prophets did not know all that the Holy Ghost intended in their visions, words, and deeds." (2. 2. 173. 4.) This principle is also promulgated in the bull "Providentissimus Deus.

It results therefore that the Church, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, may grow in the understanding of certain truths whose full import not even the original writers grasped. We see also a certain growth in the clearness of the revelation of Christ in the Old Testament, and those closer to the fulfillment of the prophecies saw with clearer view than those of old. Similarly in the Church there is a lawful growth in the understanding of doctrine. The Church has always taught the infallible truth; has always been adequately equipped to teach men; and must always preserve an identity of doctrine. But she is a living Church; and the Holy Ghost abides with her all days to teach. It follows from her life, and from the abiding of the Spirit that she grows in knowledge of the truths which were delivered to her in the beginning. Thus her unity and identity of teaching stand with her growth in knowledge.

We have before spoken of the manner in which the inspired Scriptures deal with natural sciences. St. Augustine rightly declares: "It is not read in the Gospel that the Lord said: 'I send you the Paraclete who shall teach you of

the course of the sun and the moon.' He wished to make them Christians, not mathematicians." (De actis cum Felice Manichaeo, I., 10.)

It does not follow from this that when the Scriptures speak of the stars, plants, animals, etc., that they are not veracious, for "no one except an impious man or infidel doubts of the veracity of Scripture." (Aug. On Gen. VII., 28.)

The truths of salvation are directly inspired; the other truths are indirectly inspired, on account of their relation to the direct object of inspiration. But in speaking of things of natural science, the Holy Scriptures have not treated them to the end to teach the people science; they have not treated such matters from the scientist's viewpoint: "Moses condescending to a rude people, spoke of things as they sensibly appeared." (St. Thomas, Summa, I., q. 70.) The sacred writers make use of the common parlance of the people: "*secundum opinionem populi loquitur Scriptura.*" (S. Th. I. 2. 198.) A question of vital importance, in our days, is the relation of Scripture to science. Men's minds have been active ever since the writing of Scripture itself, and have found many things unknown at the time of the writing of the Holy Books. They have delved down deep into the mysterious storehouse of nature, have discovered her treasures, have imprisoned her mighty forces to do their will and serve them in the affairs of their civil and domestic life. They have penetrated the heavens, and investigated the secrets of the vast expanse which men call the firmament. Many truths, and many more or less reasonable hypotheses have been thus found out. But science, proud of her achievements, and restless under restraint, too oft turns her powers against the God-given truths of the Sacred Text, and here the warfare waxes bitter indeed, and many there are who incline too much to the side of science, even of those of the household of faith. Since the time of Galileo, men have conceded that the Scriptures spoke according to the common opinions of the people, and attributed significations to words, which the vulgar speech of the day warranted. For God made use of a human medium to convey his message to

man, and he did not startle the people by strange expressions, which would have been unintelligible to all people at that stage of human development. Men speak thus to-day, and are not accused of inexactness or with combating science. Hence, with this in mind, we can reconcile the assertions of true science with the inspired Word of God, for there can be no combat between truth and truth; for the Author of both human and divine science is the Essential and Infinite Truth. "For although faith is above reason, no real discussion, no real conflict can be found between them since both arise from one and the same fount of immutable and eternal truth, the great and good God." (Pius IX., Encyc. of Nov. 9, 1846.) Some hypotheses broached by the incredulous and shallow dabbler in science may conflict with the truths of Scripture, but this imports nothing. The Church blesses scientific research, and fears nothing therefrom. She invites investigation into every field of human thought, and only good to herself can come therefrom. The greatest scientists and historians are her faithful children. The Vatican Council approved of scientific research explicitly, even when all the resources of science were brought to bear to oppose the Church. It leaves science free to use its own methods. "Neither does the Church forbid that these sciences should, in their own domain, use their own principles and methods." (Conc. Vat. De Fide, IV.)

Hence we should guard against attributing to a passage of Scripture a signification, which *in se* it has not, but which may have been given to it by some interpreter. When we find by incontestable evidence that science has demonstrated a truth, which is in seeming opposition to what has by some been held to be the opinion gleaned from the Holy Scriptures, we should seek some other interpretation, which the text must bear, as truth and truth can not conflict, and we can thus reconcile these two truths coming from different sources. In this manner, we may reconcile Gen. I. 14: "And God said let there be luminaries in the firmament of heaven. . . . And God made two great luminaries, a greater luminary to rule the day and a lesser luminary to rule the night,

and the stars." Now it would seem from this that the stars were less in magnitude than the moon. As science has indisputably proven the contrary, what must we admit? That the inspired writer spoke according to the appearance of things, and for us the moon is a greater luminary than the stars. Hence, even the sun is not necessarily asserted to be a greater luminary in fact than the stars, but only in appearance.

Two obstacles obstruct the way of harmony between Scripture and science; videlicet, the narrowness of view of many who essay to defend the Scriptures, and the pride and presumption of orientalists and scientists who fail to recognize that there is:

"A deep below the deep,
And a height beyond the height;
Our hearing is not hearing,
And our seeing is not sight."

Shallow draughts of science intoxicate the brain; drinking deeply sobers us. The man of large mind will be conscious of his own limitations; conscious that much that passes as science is a congeries of hypotheses, many of which change with the course of time. The exegete must also realize that where the Church has not defined the question "one should not so tenaciously adhere to any exposition formerly believed to be true, that he would not abandon it when clearly proven to be false, lest the Scriptures be derided by the unbelieving, and a way to belief be cut off from them" (St. Th. 2. Sent. 12.)

At no time in the history of the world have men's ideas of natural science been absolutely correct. In time they never will be absolutely correct. We may know some things better than the ancients; but there are many more which we shall never know. God decreed to use men at certain epochs of history to deliver a body of truths to men. Incidentally they spoke of certain natural phenomena. They used the language of their time, as men have done in every age of the world. They spoke of the material universe as it appeared to men. The language which they employed was scientifically imperfect; but they uttered no falsehood.

They used an imperfect medium to convey to man the infallible message of God. The inspired writer's conceptions of nature were imperfect, and God did not by a necessary miracle remove this imperfection before making him an instrument to utter a message in which scientific facts are only indirectly contemplated. In these enunciations concerning natural phenomena there is a direct sense and an indirect sense. When it is said that at the voice of Joshua the sun stood still, the direct sense is that the light of day was miraculously prolonged; and that fact is affirmed in the language of the writer's time.

A question of paramount importance is now to determine whether we shall apply to history that same latitude that we give to things of natural science; that is whether we shall concede that the inspired historians wrote history according to popular belief. Lagrange and his school affirm this, and make that the cardinal principle of the so-called "historical method." Not content with asserting the theory, some of them, with amazing audacity, appeal to the encyclical "*Providentissimus Deus*" in support of their hypothesis. It is to set a low value on human intelligence to ascribe such a view to the encyclical. The Holy Father wishes "his principles applied to cognate sciences and especially to history;" but it is clear that what he means is that we must *defend Scripture* not only against scientists, but against orientlists and historians, whose methods the Holy Father exposes in the very same paragraph. There is not a word in the whole encyclical favorable to the "historical method." The context clearly establishes the pontiff's meaning to be that, as we are to refute scientists when they teach falsely, and as we are to show that what they have proven is not contrary to the Scriptures, so we are to deal with history and other cognate sciences. And the pontiff immediately proceeds to state the errors of historians who wage war on the Holy Scriptures.

It is clear that there is a vast difference between the scientific statements and the historical statements of the Bible. The very essence of history is to narrate facts. We have given a fit place to allegory and parable, lyric poem and

drama. Here we speak of history which the writer wrote as history. Every genus of literature which the Bible employs must be true in the mode competent to its nature. Therefore that which is written as history must be true as history. When the Scriptures say: "God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament," the purpose of the proposition is not to teach men the nature of the heavens, but to assert that God created the heavens, and gave to nature her laws. The truths of Scripture are conceived in a human manner. Nature is spoken of as men contemplated it: in this regard the inspired writer is a child of his time, and his scientific knowledge is not in advance of his epoch. There is truth in his statement, the truth he intended to convey: there is imperfection in the accessory.

But when the Scriptures say that Cain rose against Abel and slew him, or that God rained fire and brimstone upon Sodom, if these events be the creation of folk-lore, there is no truth in them; they are false beliefs narrated as history. The nature of the narration of such facts and their context take them out of the category of allegory and parable; they are narrated as history, and must be true as history. The object of the writer is to teach men this very history, and to move men to believe it. It may be called primitive history; but it still remains true history. The fact that many myths and fables mingle in the primitive history of other peoples does not necessitate that the history of the origin of the universe as related in the Bible must also have its myths and legends. By the fact of divine inspiration the history narrated in the Bible transcends all other history, for the reason that it is infallibly true. The historical parts of Holy Scripture, and in fact all its parts, are subject to proper hermeneutical laws to determine their sense; but in the last analysis every sentence of the Bible, as it came from the inspired writer, must be true in its proper sense. History according to popular beliefs is false history, and can not be a part of the word of God.

Moreover the historical parts of the Bible are in great part the foundation of our faith. The history of the fall of our first parents bears an essential relation to the doctrine of original sin. The Redemption, the Resurrection of Christ, the foundation of the Church, the descent of the Holy Ghost are historical facts. It is needless to declare how vital these are to faith.

One of the common phrases of the "new exegesis" is to declare the historical parts of Scripture *relatively true*. If they wish to assert that the Scriptures are not God, that the Scriptures are not God's own infinitely perfect utterance, it is well. The Scriptures are God's message through human utterance by the power of God. They have the impress of their human origin upon them; but they also bear the stamp of their principal Author, and by His power they are true in every part. Wherefore if by the phrase *relatively true* they mean to say that the Scriptures contain anything that is not objectively true, the statement conflicts with Catholic belief.

It is evident therefore that while we admit fictitious history which has its proper sense of truth, we exclude myth, legend and folk-lore; for these are false narrations in the guise of history. It is an abuse of the *relative sense* theory to assert that "all the wonders related during the forty years in the desert make no necessary claim to be miracles as we define them, *i. e.*, strictly supernatural occurrences." (The Tradition of Scripture, Barry, p. 254) The writer of "The Tradition of Scripture" falls in with the tendency to pare down the supernatural, and exalt the natural. It is the trend of the age ever since protestants invented a religion that is not religious. If the miracles of the Exodus are in reality only natural phenomena believed by a credulous age to be miracles, the Bible has spoken falsely, for not in one place only does it proclaim these to be true miracles. The tendency that endeavors to eliminate miracles from the Old Testament will not stop there. It will invade the New Testament even to a "clever cut" at Christ himself. In the Syllabus of Pius IX. this proposition was condemned: "The prophecies and miracles set forth in narration in the Sacred

Scriptures are the creations of poets, and the mysteries of Christian faith are a synthesis of philosophic investigations: myths are found in both testaments, and Jesus Christ is himself a myth." The "Providentissimus Deus" most explicitly deplores and condemns the myth and legend theories of the "historical method."

We have before explained that when the inspired writer cites a testimony without either explicit or implicit approbation, inspiration does not vouch for the truth of the testimony. In such case it is only inspiredly true that the writer has made such a citation; the matter of the testimony stands on its own merit. But when the writer uses a historical source, and embodies it into his history without sufficient indication that he is relating the words of another without endorsing them, then, by every law of history, the inspired writer confers his own authority to what he writes, and makes it his own. If it were not so, history would become a jugglery of words, and no man could know what to believe.

It can not be denied that many of the sources whence Moses drew his knowledge of the first chapters of Genesis were popular tradition. The form in which facts are handed down by popular tradition differs from the style of written history. In the course down from age to age as a general thing many legends, myths, and superstitions mix in with the stream of truth. The divine agency of inspiration saved the inspired writer from handing down to us any thing false; it allowed him to preserve the popular mode in which the truths were expressed. Abstract principles are expressed as concrete facts. The true historical fact that man was created immediately by God in a state of happiness, was tempted by the devil, and fell through ambitious pride, is expressed in the form of the allegory of the garden scene at the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. God becomes anthropomorphic, walks in the garden, communes with Himself, descends to see the tower of Babel, etc. The truth of history only demands that there shall be always an objective reality of fact in all these narrations. The fact is historical; the mode in which it reached us through popular tradition is sometimes allegorical.

CHAPTER III.

THE CANON.

Canon, from Greek *κανών*, originally meant any straight rod or bar. From this basal signification were formed the cognate meanings of the amussis or carpenter's rule, the beam or tongue of the balance, and then, like "norma," any rule or standard, whether in the physical or moral order. Hence it came to be generally applied as a rule or measure of anything. It is much controverted, and quite uncertain, just what particular shade of the general meaning the old writers had in mind when they first applied this word to the official list of the Holy Books. Such question is, in fact, of no real value to any man, and yet writers quibble and haggle about it, as though upon it depended some great question. Some contend that, in applying the term to the Holy Books, the early writers passed from the active signification of the term to its effect, and used the measure for the thing measured; thus the canon would be the list officially ruled and measured by the Church. Others hold that the said writers had in mind that the Holy Books formed *a rule of faith and morals*. We are of the persuasion that the term was applied to the collection of Scriptures to signify that such list formed the *criterion and measure of a book's divine origin*. The list was thus a *rule*; for only the books which satisfied its requirements, by being incorporated in it, were of divine authority. At all events, the signification of an official list of things or persons dates back to a great antiquity. Thus, in the Councils of Nice and Antioch, the catalogue of the sacred persons attached to any particular Church was called the *canon*. Thus, to-day, those who constitute the chapter are called Canons. The appositeness of the term all must concede, for such sanctioned catalogue forms a measure of inspiration, and we receive only as inspired that which conforms to its measurement.

The canon of Holy Scripture then is *the official catalogue of the Books that the Church authoritatively promulgates as the product of the Authorship of God*.

This official list is found in the Council of Trent, Sess. 4. De Can. Script.: "The Synod has thought good to sub-

join to the decree an index of the Holy Books, lest to any man there should arise a doubt as to which are the books that are received by the said Synod. These are the following: Of the Old Testament, the five books of Moses, to wit: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Josue, Judges, Ruth, the four Books of Kings, the two Books of Paralipomenon, the First Book of Esdras and the Second which is called that of Nehemias, Tobias, Judith, Esther, Job, the Davidic Psalter of 150 Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, The Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Isaïas, Jeremias with Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel, The Twelve Minor Prophets, to wit: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Michæas, Nahum, Habakuk, Sophonias, Haggæus, Zachary, Malachy, and The First and Second of Maccabees. Of the New Testament: The Four Gospels, according to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, the Acts of The Apostles, the fourteen Epistles of the Apostle St. Paul, to wit: The Epistle to the Romans, the two Epistles to the Corinthians, the Epistle to the Galatians, the Epistle to the Ephesians, the Epistle to the Philippians, the Epistle to the Colossians, the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, the two Epistles to Timothy, the Epistle to Titus, the Epistle to Philemon, the Epistle to the Hebrews; the two Epistles of St. Peter, the three Epistles of the Apostle John, one Epistle of the Apostle James, one Epistle of the Apostle Jude, and the Apocalypse of the Apostle John." In this catalogue, there are recorded forty-five books of the Old Testament, and twenty-seven of the New.

As the Holy Books are divided into two great classes, the Old and New Testament, so we must treat separately of the canons of these two Testaments.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The books containing God's covenant to man are designated by three equivalent terms in the three great Scriptural tongues. In Hebrew it is **בְּרִית**, in Greek, *Διαθήκη* and in Latin, *Testamentum*. Although the etymological construction of these terms is not exactly identical, still, in fact, their accepted sense in this predication is the same, that of a

pact, treaty or covenant; and they designate the written instruments of God's solemn covenant with mankind.

A fundamental variation took place in God's dealings with his creature in the mission of the Messiah, and, as the Greek language became at that time the principle medium of religious thought, the changed and better economy was called in that language the *Καὶνὴ Διαθήκη*, in contradistinction to the *Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη*; hence in Latin, which later preponderated as the vehicle of religious thought, the terms were rendered by *Vetus* and *Novum Testamentum*, whence come our equivalent English terms.

The books of the Old Testament can, from their very nature, be easily divided into three great classes: the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. Such division, in fact, existed among the Jews from the very earliest times, but their arbitrary, ill-founded ranging of the different books under each particular class renders their data worthless. By their division, we must include Daniel among the Hagiographa, while Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings are enrolled among the Prophets. Of course the Law remained ever and with all a unique element, admitting no other book to be classified with itself. There was also in vogue among the Jews a well-known liturgical section of Holy Scripture, the *חֲמִשָּׁה מְגִלּוֹת* or five volumes: The Canticle of Canticles, Ruth, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, Ecclesiastes and Esther. These formed a collection which was wont to be read on certain festal days of the year.

Our Saviour and the Apostles oft divided the Old Testament in two great divisions, the Law and the Prophets; thus, in a general way, designating all that was subsequent to the Law as the Prophets.

The Jews were wont also to divide the Pentateuch into liturgical divisions which they call *פָּרָשִׁה* from root *פָּרַשׁ*, to expound. These were first arranged so that every third year the Pentateuch was totally read in the synagogues. Now, however, the Babylonian mode prevails in all the synagogues, which divides the Pentateuch in fifty-four parashas, so arranged that, by reading them on every Saturday,

they finish the Pentateuch within the course of the year. To this usage St. James alludes, Acts XV. 21: "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him in the synagogues, where he is read every Sabbath." These parashas are designated in the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch by three פ or three פ. They are designated by פ if the section begins on the beginning of the line; by פ if it begins in the middle of the line. The פ is initial for פתוחות *open*, to signify that the section is an open one, as it begins with the line; while פ is initial for סתומות *closed*, implying that the section is shut up, as it were, beginning in the middle of the line. Thus, for instance, the first parasha, Gen. I. 1—VI. 8 inclusively, is open; so also the second, extending from VI. 9—XI. inclusively, is open and designated by three פ. The parasha, enclosed from Gen. XXVIII. 11—XXXII. 3, inclusive, is closed, and designated by three פ. The parashas were subdivided into minor sections, designated in the Hebrew text by single פ or פ as they respectively began either in the beginning or middle of a line. Later, they conjoined the reading of select portions of the Prophets to the sections of the Law. They called these הפטרָה from root פטר to dismiss; because, after they were read, the people were dismissed. It was in accordance with this usage, that Jesus Christ at Nazareth read in the synagogue the passage from Isaiah, Luke IV. 16—19. This haftara is not now found among those assigned for synagogical readings. The antimesianic tendency of the Jews has probably expunged it.

Setting aside, therefore, rabbinical opinions, we can easily arrange all the books under the three great heads. First, the Law, comprising the five books of Moses; second, the Prophets, comprising the four great Prophets and the twelve minor Prophets, and lastly, the Hagiographa, composed of all the remaining books. However, modern writers find it convenient to divide the books in still another way, to facilitate their treatment. In this modern division, the motive of classification is the nature of the theme of the book. They thus divide them into Historical, Sapiential,

Poetic, and Prophetic books. We shall employ this division in our special introduction to the different books.

The well known division of both Testaments into the protocanonical and deuterocanonical books seems to have first been employed by Sixtus Sennensis (1520—1569). In his *Bibliotheca Sancta*, Book 1. Sec. 1, he writes thus: "Thus Canonical books of the first order we may call *protocanonical*; the Canonical books of the second order were formerly called ecclesiastical, but are now by us termed *deuterocanonical*." Although retaining and making use of this nomenclature, we in no wise attribute an inferior degree of dignity to the books of the second canon; they are in such respect equal, as God is the Author of all of them. We designate by the name of *protocanonical*, the books concerning whose divine origin no doubts ever existed; while the deuterocanonical books are those concerning which greater or less doubts were entertained for a time by some, till finally the genuineness of the books was acknowledged, and they were solemnly approved by the Church.

The *deuterocanonical* books of the Old Testament are seven; Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch and the two books of Maccabees. Together with these, there are deuterocanonical fragments of Esther, (from the 4th verse of 10th chapter to 24th verse of 16th chapter, and Daniel III. 24—90; XIII, XIV.) The deuterocanonical books of the New Testament are also seven in number: The Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of St. James, the Second Epistle of St. Peter, the Second and Third Epistle of St. John, the Epistle of St. Jude, and the Apocalypse of St. John. There are also deuterocanonical fragments of Mark, XVI. 9—20; Luke XXII. 43—44; and John VII. 53—VIII. 11. Many of the protestants reject all the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament, and apply to them the term Apocryphal. It shall be a part of our labors to defend the equal authority of these books.

The Jewish mode of enumeration of their Holy Books was as arbitrary and as worthless as was their system of division. Taking twenty-two, the number of the letters of their alphabet, as a number of mystic signification, they

violently made the number of the Books of Holy Scripture conform thereto. Josephus makes use of this mode of enumeration. In his defense against Apion, he says: "For we have not an innumerable multitude of books among us (*as the Greeks have*), disagreeing from and contradicting one another, but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all past times; which are justly believed to be divine." [Contra Apion I. 8.] St. Jerome also, in his famous Prologus Galeatus to the Books of Kings, testifies of the existence of such number, and explains its mystic foundation: "As there are twenty-two elements, by which we write in Hebrew all that which we speak, so twenty-two volumes are computed, by which, as by letters and rudiments, the tender and suckling infancy of the just man is trained in the doctrine of God." "And thus there are of the Old Law twenty-two books; five of Moses, eight of the Prophets, and nine of the Hagiographa. Some, however, reckon Ruth and the Lamentations among the Hagiographa, and consider that these are to be numbered in their individual number, and thus they think to be of the Old Law twenty-four books, which John personifies in the number of the twenty-four Ancients who adore the Lamb." We see then that there were two modes of enumeration, and the Fathers confused these modes in trying to adjust their enumeration to the Jewish tradition. We can not tell who was the first to find a mystic relation between the Greek alphabet of twenty-four letters and the twenty-four books, but it must have been done after the preponderance of the Hellenistic influence. The appended schema will more vividly illustrate the Jewish mode of enumeration of the Holy Books:

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|
| 1. | בְּרֵאשִׁית א | — — — — — | Genesis |
| 2. | וַאֲלֵה שְׁמוֹת ב | — — — — — | Exodus |
| 3. | וַיִּקְרָא ג | — — — — — | Leviticus |
| 4. | וַיִּדְבֵּר ד | — — — — — | Numbers |
| 5. | וַאֲלֵה חֻדְבָּרִים ה | — — — — — | Deuteronomy |
| 6. | וַיְהוֹשֻׁעַ ו | — — — — — | Joshua |

- | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|-----------|--|
| 7. | שְׁפָטִים וְרוּת יז | — — — — | Judges and Ruth |
| 8. | שְׁמוּאֵל ח | — — | { Samuel I and II, commonly
called I and II Kings. |
| 9. | מְלָכִים ט | — — | |
| 10. | יִשְׁעִיָּהוּ י | — — — — — | Isaiah |
| 11. | יֵרֵמְיָהוּ וְקִינּוֹת יב | — — — | { Jeremiah and The
Lamentations. |
| 12. | יְחִזְקֵאל ל | — — — — — | |
| 13. | נְבִיאִים חֲרֵי עֶשֶׂר ים | — | { Hosea, Joel, Amos
Obadiah, Jona, Micah
Nahum, Habakuk
Zephaniah, Haggai
Zachariah, Mala-
chia |
| <p>Literally the twelve Prophets, whom we designate as the twelve minor Prophets. These, by the Jews, were computed one book.</p> | | | |
| 14. | סֵפֶר תְּהִלִּים יד | — | Liber Laudum, or The Psalms |
| 15. | מִשְׁלֵי יו | — — — | The Proverbs of Solomon |
| 16. | אִיּוֹב יז | — — — — — | Job |
| 17. | דָּנִיֵּאל יח | — — — — — | Daniel |
| 18. | עֶזְרָא יט | — — — — — | Ezra I and II |
| 19. | דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים כ | — — — — | Chronicles I and II |
| 20. | אֶסְתֵּר כא | — — — — — | Esther |
| 21. | קוּהֶלֶת כב | — — — — — | Ecclesiastes |
| 23. | שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים כג | — — | The Canticle of Canticles |

By separating Ruth from Judges, and the Lamentations from Jeremiah, twenty-four books resulted, and these are the books of the Jewish Canon, or as it is commonly called the Canon of Ezra, from his supposed influence upon it. As no doubts have ever arisen concerning these books, they have been called the protocanonical works or books of the First Canon. Which mode of computation is prior, it is impossible to ascertain with certainty. Loisy believes the number twenty-four to be prior, as it seems to be the Talmudic number. Against this is the authority of Josephus,

who speaks of the number twenty-two as the sole traditional one. A question of so little importance may well be left in its uncertainty.

CHAPTER V.

EZRA AND HIS INFLUENCE.

The history of the canon of the Old Testament is obscure and difficult, through default of reliable documents. In tracing it through its remote antiquity, we shall endeavor to bring forth in their clearest light the certain data, filling up the lacunæ by the best warranted conjectures.

The nucleus of the Old Law was the Pentateuch, or five books of Moses. Around this centre of development were aggregated all the sacred writings of the Jews. It was the *תּוֹרָה*, the Law, par excellence, the divine book. The subsequent books, even though by them considered divine, were never held equal in dignity to "the Law by the hand of Moses." They were but adjuncts, participating in the great fount. As less reverence was entertained for these later works, so less care was taken in their preservation.

The Pentateuch was kept in the temple; it was the warrant of Israel's preeminence over all the nations of the earth. It needed no authority to canonize it; the character of its author, and the nature of its contents were all sufficient. No other book in Israel was equal to it.

The other books came into being by degrees. Most of them were first written as detached chronicles, annals, or diaries and subsequently compiled into their respective volumes. The Jews revered them, and acknowledged their divinity, but there was not, at least before Ezra's time, any central authority charged with the office of fixing the canon. Neither was there, before his time, any official list of the books of Holy Scripture. This is clearly proven by many proofs. The Samaritan Codex contains only the Pentateuch.* Had the other books been placed in a canon with the Pentateuch, the existence here of the isolated Pentateuch would be inexplicable. Cornely, in his *Introductio in*

*The Samaritan Codex contains a spurious text of the Book of Joshua, but it is evident that it is a later interpolation.

Libros Veteris Testamenti, maintains that, even before the time of Ezra, there existed a collection of sacred books, conjoined to the books of Moses. His argument to prove this is that there is evidence that the subsequent books were known and revered by the Jews, and that the preceding prophets influenced the later ones. Loisy, in refuting this, rightly says that it is quite another thing to assert that an official collection had been constituted, and to say that divers books existed, were known, and were revered. We hold that these books as they came into being were received by the Jews, but that no list was made of them, and the sole motive of their inspired character was the nature of the writing, and the authority of their authors. There is no convincing data that the prophets were commissioned by God to determine the canon of Scripture. There seems to be sufficient evidence to conclude that, previous to the time of Ezra, the five books of Moses occupied a unique place in the literature of the Jews. It was the written constitution of Israel's Yahvistic polity. At times of great defection in religion, even the Torah fell into disuse and oblivion. Thus the passage in II. Kings, XXII. 8: "And Hilkiah the high priest said to Shaphan the scribe: 'I have found the book of the Law in the house of the Lord'; and Hilkiah gave the book to Shaphan, and he read it," implies a pre-existing period of neglect and disuse of the Torah. In those fierce idolatrous upheavals in Israel, a stiff necked people, led by an impious king, soon reduced all to religious anarchy. In the restoration of the divine worship by Josiah, no mention is made of any other book than the Law. Had the other books formed a collection with the Pentateuch, they could hardly be passed over in such complete silence.

The Pentateuch then from the beginning was always the basis and directing principle of the religious and national life of the Jewish people. It suffered some vicissitudes in the various religious defections of that people, but on their return to Yahveh's Law, the Pentateuch was the centre of their reorganization.

The other books came into being by gradual growth. Most of these contained data that by living tradition was

well known to the people. The books formed a *scattered sacred literature*. The writings of the Prophets gradually were collected by their disciples and by the learned in Israel. Thus copies of the books subsequent to the Pentateuch existed in many places through the nation but they were not united with the Torah, nor considered of equal dignity with it.

We come now to deal with Ezra and his influence on Scripture. The Babylonian Captivity, wrought by Nebuchadnezzar, had overthrown all the institutions of Israel. The temple was destroyed; the priests dispersed and led into captivity; the Holy Books in a state of disorder, and Yahveh's altars demolished. To bring Israel out of her religious disorder, Ezra was sent with full power from Artaxerxes. His fitness for his commission may be inferred from I. Ezra VII. 6: "—and he was a ready scribe in the Law of Moses." Of Ezra's work as the restorer of Yahveh's worship and the reorganizer of Israel's polity, we have certain data. Concerning, however, the nature and extent of his labors on the divine books, we can only form, at most, probable judgments, and, full oft, but conjectural opinions.

Up to our days, the belief has been almost general that Ezra revised the sacred books, and fixed the Canon. That he wrought some important effects on the sacred books, we may not reasonably doubt. But to determine the *exact nature and extent* of his influence is impossible, through defect of documents. In all questions of this nature, the judgments of men will be divergent. And so in this question men have thought differently. The preponderance of Catholic thought has been that Ezra compiled and fixed the Canon. Prominent among those who have held this opinion are Serarius, Bellarmine, Bonfrere, Huet, Frassen; and more recently Welte, Herbst, Glaire, Scholz, Himpel, Ubaldi and Cornely. The most eminent Catholic writers who reject, in whole or part, the old theory of the constitution of the Canon by Ezra are, Richard Simon, Movers, Nickes, Malou, Danko, Kaulen and Loisy.

As rationalistic principles have thoroughly pervaded protestant Scriptural thought it will not aid our investi-

gation to bring forth and classify the protestant opinion concerning the influence of Ezra on the Jewish Canon.

The Talmud furnishes us some curious data on the Canon. The treatise of the Mischna, called פְּרָקֵי אָבוֹת, (the Chapters of the Fathers) opens with a testimony concerning Holy Scripture: "Moses received the Law on Sinai and delivered it to Jehoshua. Jehoshua delivered it to the Elders. The Elders delivered it to the Prophets. The Prophets delivered it to the men of the *Great Synagogue*." The Talmudic treatise פְּתַח בְּתָרָא, (The Last Gate) of the Babylonian Gemara is more explicit. In folios 14 *b* and 15 *a*, it is written: "Who wrote the Holy Books? Moses wrote his book, the section concerning Bileam and Job. Jehoshua wrote his book and eight verses in the Law. Samuel wrote his book, the book of Judges and Ruth. David wrote the Book of Psalms by means of ten Ancients, Adam the first, Melchisedech, Abraham, Moses, Heman, Iduthun, Asaph and the three sons of Kore. Jeremiah wrote his books the Book of Kings and the Lamentations. Hezekiah and his colleagues wrote Isaiah, Proverbs, the Canticle of Canticles, and Ecclesiastes. The men of the Great Synagogue wrote Ezechiel, the twelve Prophets, Daniel, and the volume of Esther. Ezra wrote his book, and continued the genealogies of the Chronicles up to his time."

We now join with these testimonies that of the apocryphal fourth book of Ezra, IV. Ezra XIV. 22-26: "For if I have found favor in thee, send in me the Holy Spirit, and I will write all that which was done in time since the beginning, the things that were written in thy law, that men might find the path; and that they who will live in the last days may live. And he made answer to me and said: 'Go and summon the people, and say to them that they shall not seek thee for forty days, and do thou prepare for thyself many writing tablets, and take with thee Sarea, Dabrea, Salemia, Echan and Asiel, those five, who are able to write quickly, and come hither, and I will enkindle in thy heart the light of intellect, which shall not be extinguished until thou shalt

* The commentatorial treatises of the Gemara were called *gates*, since they *opened the way* for the intelligence of the different truths.

have finished the things thou shalt have begun to write. And then, a part thou shalt openly manifest to the perfect, and a part thou shalt deliver secretly to the wise; on the morrow, at this hour, thou shalt begin to write."

"And I was brought to the morrow; and, behold, a voice called me saying: 'Ezra, open thy mouth and drink that which I will give thee to drink.' And I opened my mouth, and behold a full cup was held out to me. This was filled with water, and the color thereof as of fire, and I took and drank; and when I had drunk, my heart was exceedingly filled with knowledge, and in my bosom wisdom grew. For the memory of my spirit was strengthened. And my mouth was opened, and was no more closed. The Most High gave understanding to the five men, and they wrote the visions of the night which were told them, and which they knew not. And at night they ate bread. But I spoke through the day, and through the night I was not silent. And there were written, during forty days, 204 books. And it came to pass, after forty days, the Most High spoke saying: 'The first things thou hast written make openly manifest, and let the worthy and the unworthy read; but the latter seventy preserve, that thou mayest give them to the wise men of thy people. For in these is the vein of understanding, and the fount of wisdom, and the stream of knowledge.' And I did so." (Ibid. 38-47.)

Up to the eighteenth century, the Latin of the Vulgate was the only text preserved to us of IV. Ezra. Since then there have been discovered the Arabic, Æthiopian, Syriac, and Armenian versions. In these the whole number of books is placed at ninety-four instead of 204; whence, if we subtract the seventy which were to remain hidden for the sole use of the wise men, we shall have the traditional number twenty-four of the Jewish Canon.

Cornely makes much of this testimony as being built upon the true basis of Jewish tradition. We confess, though admitting some basis of truth, we can not find anything in it that would convince the intellect that Ezra fixed the Canon. The role of Ezra as a second promulgator of the Law would be sufficient basis for the rabbinical fable.

We have not adduced these testimonies as peremptory proofs of anything. They are all more or less imbued with rabbinic fable. But perhaps, there may be some slight truth in these which has been distorted by the vagaries of the Rabbis, till it is hard to glean it from the composite mass.

We believe that the tradition of the Christian Fathers will give us small help in this investigation. As it was merely a critical question, and in nowise connected with faith, the authority of the Fathers could only be considered in its critical character. Now it is evident to the tyro of patrology that the Fathers are least valuable as critics. As simple witnesses of the faith, they are beacon lights; but when we turn to their critical character, we find little of value. Most of those who have delivered to us that Ezra fixed the canon, based their assertions on the Fourth Book of Ezra, a book filled with rabbinic fable, impossible superstition, and erroneous dogma. St. Irenæus, St. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, St. Basil, Theodoret, St. Optatus, and others have relied implicitly on the testimony of the Fourth Book of Ezra. Some, as St. Chrysostom, St. Isidore of Seville, St. Bede, have tried to make the passage of the Fourth Book of Ezra credible by restricting the character of Ezra within somewhat narrower bounds. (See Loisy, *Hist. du Canon de l'Ancient Testament.*)

Having brought forth these preliminary testimonies, we now proceed to more closely examine the question of Ezra's influence on the Scripture. Ezra restored the Yahvistic worship, and promulgated the Law. This rests on the clear testimony of an inspired book. The 8th and 9th Chapters of the II. Book of Ezra firmly establish the character of Ezra as reorganizer of Israel and promulgator of the Law; but when we would extend his influence on the Scripture further than this, we are unsustained by certain data. In view of these facts, it is well to first set forth what Ezra did not do, and, secondly, proceed to establish the most reasonable probable judgments concerning what he did. We place, therefore, as a thesis, that there are no adequate data to establish that Ezra promulgated an official list of the holy

books of the Jews; but, on the contrary, probable data seem to warrant that no such official list was ever promulgated among the Jews by any authority.

To prove this thesis, we find one convincing proof in the fact that there is not a testimony in the patrimony of Scriptural science which asserts any such fact. Men, it is true, have asserted such fact; but they lacked one requisite element of a faithful witness, knowledge of the fact. The Fathers followed the pseudo Ezra; hence their authority is no greater than his, which is nothing. The Babba Bathra of the Talmud, quoted above, speaks of the Scripture as though reduced to definite list, but its authority, even though believed implicitly, would prove nothing for the supposed character of Ezra. The Baba Bathra does not antedate the second century of the Christian era, and, at that time, the list of the Jewish Canon was complete, not by definite authority, but by the common consent of the Jewish people and its teachers. The Baba Bathra does not attribute the fixing of the Canon to Ezra, and no other document worthy of faith does so. We think that a fact of such importance would not be passed over in silence, while so many others of much less importance are detailed to us in the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Maccabees.

The Talmud records many disputes concerning the canonicity of some of the books of the Old Testament. Behold an example: "Rabbi Juda has said that the Canticle of Canticles defiles the hands; but Ecclesiastes is contested.* Rabbi Joseph said: 'Ecclesiastes does not defile the hands.' Rabbi Simon said: 'The disciples of Schammai judged more unfavorably of Ecclesiastes than the disciples of Hillel.' Rabbi Simeon, son of Azai, said: 'I have learned from every one of the mouths of the seventy ancients that this question was settled when Rabbi Eleazar, son of Azarias, was installed in office.' Rabbi Akiba said: 'May it please God, no Israelite has ever doubted that the Canticle of Canticles defiles the hands. The world has nothing more precious

*To render the hands impure was the rabbinic expression to express that a book was inspired, as they must needs wash their hands after touching an inspired book.

than the day on which the Canticle of Canticles was given to Israel. All the Hagiographa are holy, but the Canticle of Canticles is most holy. If discussion has existed, it was concerning Ecclesiastes.' Rabbi Jochanan, son of Joshua, son of the father-in-law of Rabbi Akiba, said: 'It was discussed and decided as has said the son of Azai.' " (Tr. Jadaim III. 5.) Again: "The doctors wished to place in obscurity the Book of Ecclesiastes, for the reason that its discourses were contrary to the Law. Why did they not place it apart? Because it begins and ends with the words of the Law." (Tr. Sabbath 30.)

These contentions among the Talmudists give evidence of doubts concerning various books of Scripture. If the Canon had been made out and promulgated by Ezra, would not his authority have been cited here to decide concerning these books? If, as our opponents assert, the fixing of the Canon by Ezra rests on Talmudic tradition, we ought certainly to hear some word of him in these disputes. On the contrary, he is only mentioned as the author of his book and the continuator of Chronicles.

The Book of Ecclesiasticus, written very probably about the year 180, B. C., in Chapters XLIV. to XLIX. speaks of Israel's heroes and sages, and, although it exhorts that Nehemiah be a long time remembered, it has no word of Ezra. This would seem incomprehensible had Ezra collected and authoritatively promulgated the Canon. Moreover, Daniel and Esther are not mentioned among the illustrious ones of Israel, and there seems to be no other credible reason than that these books had not, at that date, entered the Jewish Canon, and, consequently, were unknown to the author of Ecclesiasticus.

The Jews of Palestine, in their second letter to their confederates of Alexandria, make offer to send them the books that Nehemiah and Judas had collected: "And these same things were set down in the memoirs and commentaries of Nehemiah, and how he made a library, and gathered the writings concerning the kings, and the Prophets and the (writings) of David, τὰ τοῦ Δαυὶδ, and the letters of the kings treating of the oblations. And in like manner Judas also gathered together all such things as were lost by the war we had, and

they are in our possession." We see in this testimony a description of a collection of books of national importance to Israel, partly sacred and partly profane. It is quite probable that the sacred books therein included were the first and later Prophets, according to the Jewish mode of enumeration, and the Psalms of David. The other works were, doubtless, epistles of the Persian kings, of importance in the government of a country now a vassalage of Persia. It is plainly evident that Nehemiah did not collect the Canon of Scripture but a collection of important books sacred and profane, which, joined to the later collection of Judas Maccabæus, formed a sort of national library, to a participation of which the Jews of Palestine invited their brothers of Alexandria. This testimony also is a factor to refute the generally received opinion that Ezra closed the Canon. Most probably, he co-operated with Nehemiah in this enterprise; but the very fact of a collection of certain sacred books into the national library presupposes that no complete authentic list of the Scriptures was in possession of Israel. Had it been made subsequently, some trace of it would have been left in the records of the Jews. We believe, therefore, that the opinion which attributes to Ezra the collection and closing of the Canon to be devoid of historical basis and untenable.

We now pass to consider what influence Ezra did exert upon the Holy Books. The selection of him, "a scribe able in the Law," implies that there was some reconstruction of Holy Scripture for him to do. We have before said that he promulgated the Law to the returned exiles. What revision he wrought on the Torah, it is impossible to say, but we are ready to believe that he revised in some respects Israel's great code. He also evidently explained this law to the people, and put into execution its enactments. This is Ezra's distinguishing function in history. As reorganizer of Israel's polity, we are ready to believe that he did collect and revise Israel's sacred literature, and that many books came under his influence. How many, we can not say. We must here simply rely on conjecture. But, from the fact of the collection by Nehemiah, one may see that the reconstructive spirit of Nehemiah and Ezra tended to bring together Israel's sacred

deposit of writings. They did this without any *ex professo* declaration of promulgating a canon; and it is highly probable that not all the Holy Books of the first Canon were collected into a body of writings at their epoch. Gradually the sacred collection was made up, and, at the time of Christ, the Jews considered the list of Holy Books as complete and fixed. The nucleus of the collection was the Thorah. Around this centre, the Holy Books formed themselves into a recognized collection by the concurrence of various causes, and their warranty for entrance into the sacred collection was not any decree or order of canonization by any authority but the fact that their contents were conformable to the living traditions of the people, and reflected the things which a tenacious Eastern memory had learned from law and prophet.

Concerning Daniel the Abbé Glaire declares thus: "It seems to me, admitting, as I also do, the perfect canonicity of Daniel, that the book being collected at Babylon, possibly after the death of its author, it was later brought to Jerusalem, and found place only at the end of the works already in the Canon." (Introduction I. 1868.)

Ezra may have revised many of the holy books; he may have collected all those attainable at that time; we are ready to admit his influence upon Scripture to have extended even to the correcting of the Pentateuch, but we deny him an official promulgation of an incomplete canon of Scripture, at the very time when other books of divine origin were in actual existence, although not in his possession. In the Talmudic testimonies adduced above, mention is made of a great synagogue, **בְּנֵי־הַיָּהוּדָה**, organized by Ezra. Much that is fabulous has been written concerning this great synagogue. Many reject it *in toto* as a rabbinic fable. Here again historical data are wanting. Besides the Talmudic authority already quoted, the Jews of the middle age, Abarbanel, Abraham ben David, and Maimonides recount that the Great Synagogue was composed of 120 members. Ezra was president, and the Prophets Haggai, Zachary and Malachi were among its members. It endured from the year 444, B.C., down to the time of Simon the Just, about the year 200 of the Christian era. The writings of the middle age are char-

acterized by the same spirit of extravagant fable which robs the Talmud of all historic worth, hence we can not treat these assertions as historic data. At most, there may be in them a basic thread of true tradition, which is well nigh lost amid a web of fable. Even those who have credulously accepted the legend of Ezra's Canon have rejected the story of the Great Synagogue. No convincing data are at hand to establish the existence of such a body organized by Ezra, and yet such an organization, though not of such proportions as the Rabbis assert, may have been created by him. That a body of men called the Synedrion or Sanhedrim existed at the opening of the Christian era is not doubted. It is quite certain that Christ referred to this body in Math. V., 22: "But I say to you, that whosoever is angry with his brother, shall be in danger of the judgment, and whosoever shall say to his brother, רָקָא, (cerebro vacuus), shall be in danger of the council." It is impossible to fix the date of origin of this assembly. Many Jews refer it back to the origin of their polity under Moses. Of course this is a vagary. Christian writers diverge widely in their opinions concerning it. Nothing certain is available. Without admitting the fables of the Rabbis, might it not be the evolution of a legislative body organized by Ezra to aid in administering the civil and religious affairs of re-organized Israel? The question, like many others of a like nature, only admits of a conjectural answer.

It is certain that the Providence of God entered as chief factor in preserving the Holy Books through so many vicissitudes. He, as ever, did this *suaviter et fortiter*. As he was back of the collection, they were safe, and there is no need of bringing the unsubstantial legend of Ezra's Canon to protect a collection of books which the Providence of God protected in his own way. But in the accessions to the central nucleus of the Jewish Canon, after the fourth century, a distinction was made, whence has sprung a leading question in the history of the Canon. Malachi closes the series of the Hebrew prophets. Nothing certain is known of the identity of this prophet. Some have believed the Hebrew name מְלָאכִי (angelus meus) to be an appellative of Ezra, or of

another Jew of that period, designating the particular function of the last of the Prophets. Cornely sustains by probable arguments, that Malachi is the proper name of an individual. The Jews recognized in him the last of the Prophets, and termed him **הַנְּבִיאִים חוֹתֶם** (sigillum Prophetarum). Whatever view we adopt, Malachi's period must have been about four hundred years B.C. The accessions to the Palestinian Canon subsequent to Malachi were accorded a secondary rank. They were by no means considered as mere profane creations, but from the fact that the series of the Prophets was closed, the effusion of the Holy Ghost was not believed to be so directly reflected in these books as in the others. This secondary influence of the Holy Ghost they denominated the **בֵּית קוֹל** (filia vocis). We find in no place an explicit enumeration of the several books whose writers were supposed to be actuated by the *bath kol*, but all indications seem to evince that they were the deuterocanonical works of the Old Testament.

From the first, these books existed in the Alexandrian Canon, which was totally derived from the sacred books of the Jews of Palestine, and the celebrated testimony of Flavius Josephus, now to be adduced, clearly asserts the existence and preservation of certain semi-divine books, which had been collected after the close of prophecy in the reign of Artaxerxes. Now these books can be naught else than the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament. The testimony of Josephus exists in his "Defense Against Apion," Bk. I., Parag. 8: "For we have not an innumerable multitude of books disagreeing from and contradicting one another, as the Greeks have, but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times, which are justly believed to be divine. And of them, five belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. This interval of time embraces nearly three thousand years. From the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes, who reigned after Xerxes, the Prophets who were after Moses wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of

human life. It is true, our history hath been writtten since Artaxerxes *very particularly, but hath not been esteemed of the like authority with the former by our forefathers, because there hath not been an exact succession of Prophets since that time:* and how firmly we have given credit to these books of our own nation, is evident by what we do; for during so many ages as have already passed, no one hath been so bold as either to add anything to them, or take anything from them, or make any change in them; but it is become natural to all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to esteem these books to contain divine doctrines, and to persist in them and, if occasion be, willingly to die for them."

Although some of the deuterocanonical books contain history that must have antedated Artaxerxes, nevertheless, as the date of their accession to the Hebrew Canon was subsequent to Artaxerxes, Josephus confounds the date of their accession with the date of their origin. These books, then, existed in the Palestinian collection as *secondarily divine* books. The Talmuds of Jerusalem and Babylon contain quotations from Ecclesiasticus. Josephus, who was an apt expounder of Pharisaic traditions, makes use of the deuterocanonical fragments of Esther and the second book of Maccabees.

Eusebius (Eccl. Hist. VI. 25) gives us the Canon of Scriptures according to Origen. After enumerating the protocanonical works, he says: "There are also the Maccabees which are inscribed *Sarbeth Sarbaneel*." St. Hilary in Prol. in Psalter. testifies that Tobias was read among the Hagiographa of the Jews. St. Epiphanius, Haer. VIII. No. 6, testifies that Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus were in honor among the Jews, and distinguished from the apocryphal works. St. Isidore says of Wisdom: "As a certain one of those who know has recorded, the Hebrews received this work (Wisdom) among the Canonical Scriptures. But after they had seized and killed the Christ, remembering the most evident testimonies concerning Christ in that same book, in which it is written: 'The impious said among themselves, 'let us seize the just,' etc., taking counsel, lest we might lay upon them such an evident sacrilege, they cut

it off from the prophetic volumes, and prohibited its reading to their people." The Apostolical Constitutions testify that Baruch was read in the Jewish synagogues.* St. Jerome testifies in his preface to the book of Judith that among the Hebrews Judith is read "among the Hagio-grapha." "Its authority," he continues, "is considered less apt to decide things about which there is dispute. It is written in Chaldaic, and reckoned among the historical books." We think it to be a position admitting of no reasonable doubt that the deuterocanonical works of the Old Testament primarily existed in the collection of the Jews of Palestine. The narrow, nugatory, reactionary spirit of the latter day Jews, exemplified in the Pharisees, denied to these books canonicity, as we understand the term; but we can find no evidence that they denied them a divine origin. They are not found in the Hebrew collection of books to-day, but this can be readily explained. The same spirit which moved the Jews of Palestine to deny these books equal rank with the others, impelled them later to entirely exclude them. It would be hard to fix the date of this exclusion. It is probable that they gradually died out of the different codices, till, at last, all trace of them disappeared in the Palestinian Canon.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ALEXANDRIAN CANON.

Opposite causes effected the preservation of these books in the Alexandrian Canon. The Jews of Egypt depended in matters of religion on the Jews of Palestine. Abundant data prove that they received their collection of Holy Books from Palestine. This was not accomplished all at once. It began with the translation of the Law, made under Ptolemy Philadelphus in the third century B.C., and continued down to the first century B.C. The influence of Greek

*The Constitutions of The Holy Apostles are a composite work, some of which may be as early as the second century of the Christian era. It seems quite probable that they originated in Syria. The only relation that they bear to the Apostles is that they reflect the Apostolical traditions of the times. They were declared apocryphal by the decree of Gelasius, but still are of value inasmuch as they preserve for us the traditions of the first ages of Christianity.

thought and customs on the Hellenistic Jews modified the narrow national spirit of that nation. Later, in the time of the Maccabees, the pagan Greek customs were readily adopted by the Jewish youth. This liberal trend of religious thought effected that the deuterocanonical books were received and *intermingled promiscuously with the other books*. It is quite probable that there was always a certain degree of uncertainty and indecision in the synagogues of Alexandria. The minute, sharply drawn, Pharisaic distinctions did not obtain there. They had left home and home traditions, and, blending with a highly cultivated nation, even those who clung to the substance of the Mosaic covenant lost much of their conservative spirit. As they read the Scriptures in Greek, the deuterocanonical books were not distinguishable by difference of tongue from the books of the first Canon. On the contrary, in Palestine the Scriptures were inseparably cast in the mould of the Hebrew mother tongue. The strong love of the Hebrews for their mother tongue would naturally incline the Jews of Palestine to look with less favor on a sacred book not written in the Hebrew language. Now some of the deuterocanonical books, such as Wisdom and II. Maccabees, were of Greek origin. It is quite probable that some of the others were already translated into Greek before their aggregation to the sacred collection, hence is explained their secondary place among the sacred books, and also why they are not found in the Hebrew Canon of to-day. It seems also quite certain that the Hellenistic Jews made no distinction between the protocanonical and the deuterocanonical books. Had such distinction been made, the books of secondary importance would have been relegated to the end of the collection. Now the direct opposite is found to have prevailed. Protocanonical and deuterocanonical works are indiscriminately intermingled in the Alexandrian Canon. This indiscriminate adoption of the deuterocanonical books was not the canonizing of these by the Alexandrians. It was a mere fact, which its authors had never taken thought to explain. Had they formally rendered equal these various books by an explicit declaration, it would have led to controversy between

the Hellenists and the Jews of Palestine. No trace of any such controversy is found in the records and traditions of antiquity. The Jews of Palestine were not hostile to the deuterocanonical works, but, from the causes already enumerated, refused to accord them equal rank with the others. The Jews of Alexandria, without deciding the issue, received and revered them all, and intermingled them in the sacred collection.

There is plainly evident in this fact the workings of the Providence of God. The Almighty had decreed to effect the transition from the old to the new covenant through the medium of Greek language and culture. Israel was to receive the Christ in fulfillment of Yahveh's promises, but the great Gentile world was to be the chosen people of the New Covenant. Under the Providence of God, Alexander the Great brought the known world under Greek influence, and gave it the Greek language as the medium of thought. The Romans reduced this vast extent of territory to peace without changing the language. Thus two conditions favorable for the evangelization of the world were accomplished, peace and a uniform adequate vehicle of thought. It is easy to see how these two factors aided in the spread of the Gospel. Now, it was also expedient that the existing Scriptures should be in the universal tongue of the civilized world. We can see how the teachers of the New Covenant availed themselves of this element, since, with a few exceptions, they always make use of the Greek text of Scripture when quoting the Old Testament. Hence, the Providence of God brought it about that in the Greek there should exist a complete body of Scriptures. God was less solicitous about the Palestinian collection, because that was not to be the medium of grafting the new scion on the old stock. Thus the Alexandrians were instruments in the hands of God in collecting a complete body of Scriptures, which that same Providence has ever protected as the great basic element in the deposit of faith. The first virtual canonization of the deuterocanonical books was the approbation of the Alexandrian collection of books by the teachers of the New Law.

We have hitherto assumed that the deuterocanonical books were indiscriminately intermingled with the other books in the Alexandrian collection. That we may not be thought to assume unproven things, we shall adduce a few proofs of this well warranted fact. In the first place, we may remark that the only ones who would be likely to deny this would be the protestants. Now Davidson, a protestant, in his Canon of the Bible admits this as an obvious fact. "The very way," he says, "in which apocryphal (deuterocanonical) are inserted among canonical books in the Alexandrian Canon shows the equal rank assigned to both." We may consider a first proof, the presence of these books in the Christian Canon of the first ages. Now certainly they received their collection of the Old Testament from the Greek Canon. Though the codices whence they took their Canon have perished, yet the exemplars now existing were faithfully reproduced from them. The translation known as the *Vetus Itala*, which dates back to the 2nd century of the Christian era, had all the deuterocanonical works, and this was certainly made from the Alexandrian collection. The great codices of the Vatican and Mt. Sinai, going back probably to the fourth century, contain these works. The early Fathers were as conversant with the deuterocanonical works as with the rest of Holy Scripture. The subjects of the art of the Catacombs are largely taken from the deuterocanonical works. Such early and universal approbation could not be effected, had not these books been delivered to the Christian Church by the Old Covenant through the medium of the Greek.

It should not appear strange that all our attention is now centering upon the deuterocanonical books. This is the great issue between the protestants and us. The protocanonical works need no defense, except against the rationalists. Our defense against them will appear later in our work. Those who reject the protocanonical works attack the whole basis of religious belief. But those who reject the deuterocanonical works profess still to accept God's word to man. With them, is the first issue. We shall first endeavor to prove that the writers of the New Law, by

accepting and employing the Alexandrian text of Holy Scripture, in which were the deuterocanonical books, virtually canonized that collection of Scriptures.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CANON OF THE CHURCH.

There is no trace in writing or tradition of any formal decision rendered by Jesus Christ or his Apostles concerning the Canon of the Old Testament. However, their use of the Alexandrian text of Scripture is equivalent to an express decree. It were incompatible with the character of the teachers of mankind and organizers of the Church, to make use of a collection of Scripture in which profane and inspired books were commingled. That they formulated no decree concerning the Canon of Scripture, proves that the Scriptures are subordinate to the Church. They, in virtue of the power given by the Master, were to found a living teaching body. The institutions of men exist by force of the fixed decrees and constitutions upon which their stability is based. The institution of Christ exists by virtue of the perpetual living vigor that energizes within her. She may pay small heed to human enactments, even though of infallible agents, for her warranty is in her living constitution, which is the almighty power of the Holy Ghost, her vital principle. Hence the Scriptures are only an instrument in the hands of the Church. Christ and his Apostles founded the teaching body, which should guard the Scriptures, and at the proper time fix the Canon. In all our investigations concerning the Canon, it is the authority of the Church in the background which forms the great complement of the motive of credibility. No man can go securely through the dim vista of those remote times without the beacon light of the Church. It is not by the sole force of historical data, that we believe that the deuterocanonical works have God for their author. We receive them on the authority of the Church, and then trace the conformity between the books' history and the dogma of the Church. A man would defeat his own purpose, should he attempt to convert one to Catholicity by proving that the

deuterocanonical works had equal title to canonicity. Prove first that there is a God; then that there is a Christ; then that there is a Church; and lastly exhort him to humbly ask Christ's teacher what to believe.

St. Jerome after much hedging was forced to admit that the Alexandrian collection was approved by the Apostles. He would, indeed, have us believe that, where the Septuagint differed from the Hebrew, the Apostles made use of the Hebrew. This is contradicted by the other Fathers, and is disproven by an examination and comparison of the two texts. St. Irenæus' authority is explicit in favor of our thesis. "The Apostles, being older than all these, (Aquila and the other Greek interpreters) are in accord with the aforesaid (Septuagint) translation, and the translation corresponds with the tradition of the Apostles. For Peter and John and Matthew and Paul and the others and their followers announced the prophetic things *according to the Septuagint*." [Contra Haer. III. 21, 3.] Origin testifies that Paul, in Epist. to Romans, follows the Septuagint in everything, except, perchance, things of minor moment. [Orig. in Rom. VIII. 6.] The Syrian Jacobites, by the testimony of their primate Barhebræus preferred the Syrian version of Scripture, that had been made from the Septuagint to the earlier one made from the Hebrew, because the one made from the Septuagint was more in consonance with the discourses of Our Lord and his Apostles.

From the sixteenth century down, critical collation has been made of the passages of the Old Testament, quoted in the New. From the labors of Serarius, Morini, Capelli, Kautzsch, and others, it results that, of three hundred and fifty passages of the Old Testament quoted in the New, more than three hundred so agree with the Septuagint that it is evident that the writer was using that text as a source. Sts. Peter, James, Mark, Luke, and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews *always quote from the Septuagint*; St. Paul, *almost always*; and Sts. Matthew and John very often quote from it. The reason for such course of action is evident. They were to convert a Greek world. By the Providence of God, a version of Scripture existed in Greek. They were

but following out the great plan of Salvation, by employing the resources of this existing text of Scripture in the evangelization of the world. Had such text been interspersed with 'spurious books and fragments such line of action would ill fit the teachers of the world. Our adversaries endeavor to enfeeble the force of this argument by alleging that no deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament is expressly quoted in the New. This fact we admit; but we deny that it weakens our position. Davidson, in Canon of the Bible, though not in the least friendly to Catholic opinions rejects this argument against the deuterocanonical books. On page 77: "When Bishop Cosius says that in all the New Testament we find no passage of apocryphal (deuterocanonical) books to have been alleged either by Christ or his Apostles for the confirmation of His doctrine, the argument, though based on a fact, is scarcely conclusive; else, Esther, Canticles, and other works might be equally discredited." In the New Testament Obadiah, Nahum, the Canticle of Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Ezra and Nehemiah are neither quoted from nor alluded to. It needs not an explicit quotation to approve a book. The approbation of the version which recognized these books was a sufficient warranty for their inspiration. Express quotations in the New Testament are generally taken from the Law or the Prophets; the other books are more oft *implicitly* cited, and it is only by the general similarity between the passages that we may detect that the writer of the New Testament had in mind any particular book of the Old Testament. Now there are many passages in the New Testament, which, when closely examined, bear evidence that the writer had in mind some book of the deuterocanonical collection. As this identity of thought appears to better advantage from the Greek, we collate a few texts in that tongue.

Σοφία Σειραχ. κεφ. Ε. 11

Γίνου ταχύς ἐν ἀκροάσει σου,
καὶ ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ φθέγγου ἀπό-
κρισιν.

Ἰακώβου Ἐπιστολὴ κεφ. Α΄.

19.—ἔστω δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος τα-
χύς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ
λαλῆσαι, βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν.

Ecclesiasticus V. 11.

Esto velox in auscultatione tua, et in longanimitate profer responsum.

Σοφία Σειραχ κεφ. ΚΗ'. 2.

Ἄφες ἀδίκημα τῷ πλησίον σου, καὶ τότε δεηθέντος σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου λυθήσονται.

Eccli. XXVIII. 2.

Remitte injuriam proximo tuo, et tunc deprecanti tibi peccata solventur.

Σοφία Σαλωμών κεφ. Γ'. 5, 6.

Καὶ ὀλίγα παιδευθέντες μεγάλα εὐεργετηθήσονται, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἐπέραςεν αὐτοὺς καὶ εὗρεν ἀξίους ἑαυτοῦ, ὡς χρυσὸν ἐν χωνευτηρίῳ ἐδοκίμασεν αὐτούς, καὶ ὡς ὀλοκάρπωμα θυσίας προσεδέξατο αὐτούς.

Wisdom III. 5-6.

Et in paucis vexati, in multis bene disponentur. Quoniam Deus tentavit eos, et invenit eos dignos se. Tamquam aurum in fornace probavit eos; quasi holocausti hostiam accepit illos.

Κεφ. Ζ'. 26.

Ἀπαύγασμα γὰρ ἐστὶ φωτὸς αἰδίου καὶ ἔσοπτρον ἀκηλίδωτον τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνεργείας καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ.

Jas. I. 19.

Sit omnis homo velox ad audiendum, tardus ad loquendum tardus ad iram.

Ἐυαγ. κατὰ Ματθ. VI. 14.

Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, ἀφήσει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος.

Math. VI. 14.

Nam si dimiseritis hominibus delicta sua, dimittet et vobis pater vester coelestis,

Πέτρου Α. κεφ. Α. 6—7.

Ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιάσθε ὀλίγον ἄρτι εἰ δέον λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολὺ τιμιώτερον χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου εὕρεθῇ εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

I Pet. I. 6—7.

In quo exultatis, nunc ad breve tempus afflicti variis temptationibus, si opus sit: ut probatio fidei vestrae multo pretiosior auro quod perditur, et tamen per ignem probatur, reperiat in laudem et gloriam et honorem in revelatione Jesu Christi.

Πρὸς Ἑβραίους κεφ. Α'. 3.

Ὅς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, κτλ.

Ibidem VII. 26.

Epist. ad Hebræos I. 3.

Etenim lucis æternæ splendor est, atque speculum virtutis et impressa imago substantiæ Dei nulla macula aspersum, illius, etc. ejusque imago bonitatis.

Many more texts of this character may be collected from a comparison of the deuterocanonical books with the New Testament. See Huet, *Demonst. Evang. Prop.* IV. and Vincenzi, *Sessio IV. Conc. Trid. Vindicata.*

The Fathers of the Church continued the approbation of the Apostles, and made no distinction in their frequent citations from Scripture between protocanonical and deuterocanonical works. None of the Apostolical Fathers has drawn up a Canon of Scripture. The injury of time has robbed us of much of their writings, but, in the few preserved to us, most frequent passages are found from the deuterocanonical works, of such mode of quotation that it is evident that they recognized these books as divine Scripture. St. Clement of Rome, who holds a high place in the primitive church, in his *Epist. to the Corinthians*, employs the book of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus. He made an analysis of the book of Judith and the Greek version of Esther with its deuterocanonical fragments.*

His use of the deuterocanonical books may be seen from a comparison of the following collated passages:

Sap. IV. 24.

Clem. I. ad Cor. III.

"Invidia autem diaboli mors introivit in orbem terrarum."

"Sed secundum pravas ipsius concupiscentias incedit, iniquam et impiam invidiam resumendo per quam et mors in mundum intravit."

Sap. XI. 22.

Clem. I. Cor. XXVII.

"Virtuti brachii tui quis resistet?"

"Quis resistet virtuti fortitudinis ejus?"

*St. Clement of Rome, was a disciple of St. Peter, from whom, according to Tertullian, he received ordination. He succeeded Anacletus in the Roman See in the year 91 of the Christian Era. He is mentioned by St. Paul in the *Epist. to the Philippians*. His death is placed about the year 100. Although some have controverted his martyrdom, he is placed among the martyrs in the Canon of the Mass.

Sap. XII. 12.

"Quis enim dicet tibi: Quid fecisti?"

Ibid.

"Quis dicet ei: Quid fecisti?"

Judith VIII. 30, et seqq.

Clem. I. Cor. LV.

"Beata Judith, cum urbs obsideretur, rogavit seniores ut sibi liceret in alienigenarum castra transire, ac seipsam periculo tradens propter caritatem patriæ populique obsessi egressa est; et Dominus tradidit Olophernem in manu feminæ.

Esther V., XIV., XV. et seqq?

Nec minus perfecta secundum fidem Esther periculo se objecit."

Among the genuine works of Clement of Rome are, by some, reckoned the two *Epistolæ ad Virgines*.*

Ecclesiasticus V. 14.

"Si est tibi intellectus, responde proximo; sin autem, sit manus tua super os tuum."

Clem. I. ad Virg. XI.

"Si est tibi intellectus, responde proximo; sin autem, sit manus tua super os tuum."

Ecclesiasticus IX. 8

"Averte faciem tuam a muliere compta, et ne circumspicias speciem alienam. Propter speciem mulieris multi perierunt, et ex hac concupiscentia quasi ignis exardescit"

Clem. II. ad Virg. XIII.

"Ne circumspicias speciem alienam. Propter speciem mulieris multi perierunt."

Ibid 12.

"Cum aliena muliere ne sedas omnino, nec accumbas cum ea, super cubitum

Clem. Ibid.

"Cum muliere aliena ne sedas omnino."

*Funk in his *Patr. Apost.* rejects the genuinity of these two *Epistles*, but his chief argument is that in them the texts from Scripture are more literally quoted than in the *Epist. ad Corinthios*. Beelen and others have defended the authenticity of these *Epistles*, and we see no reason why a sane criticism should reject them. They have come down to us through the Syriac, and have been translated into Latin by Wetstein, and later by Villecourt.

Ibid. IX. 4.

"Cum saltatrice ne assiduus sis, nec audias illam, ne forte pereas in efficacia illius."

Dan. XIII. 8.

"Et videbant eam senes quotidie ingredientem, et deambulantem: et exarserunt in concupiscentiam ejus."

Ibid. 42—44.

"Exclamavit autem voce magna Susanna, et dixit: Deus aeternae, qui absconditorum es cognitor, qui nosti omnia antequam fiant, tu scis quoniam falsum testimonium tulerunt contra me: et ecce morior, cum nihil horum fecerim, quae isti malitiose composuerunt adversum me. Exaudivit autem Dominus vocem ejus."

Clement Ibid.

"Cum saltatrice ne assiduus sis, nec audias illam, ne pereas in efficacia illius."

Ibid. XIII.

"Nonne ex iisdem Scripturis notum tibi est quid, ad tempora Susannae, narretur de senibus illis qui, cum frequenter starent inter mulieres, contemplati pulchritudinem alienam, in concupiscentiae barathrum praecipites sese dederunt. Castitatis quidem pretium noverunt, sed ipsius jugum fregerunt. Hinc appetitui perverso venumdati, in beatam Susannam conspirarunt ut eam constuprarent. At illa turpe ipsorum desiderium frustrata est. Innocentiae suae testem invocavit Deum, qui de manibus impiorum senum eam liberavit."

The document of the first century, commonly known as the Epistle of St. Barnabas, also employs the deuterocanonical books*

Ecclesiasticus IV. 36.

"Non sit porrecta manus tua ad accipiendum et ad dandum collecta."

Epist. S. Barnabæ XIX. 19.

"Noli porrigere manus tuas ad accipiendum, ad dandum vero contrahere."

The Pastor of Hermas, a document that goes back to the 1st or 2d century, makes use of deuterocanonical works. It is impossible to fix the identity of the author of the Pastor. Some believed him to be the Hermas mentioned by Paul to

*St. Barnabas was a Cyprian Jew of the tribe of Levi. Having embraced Christianity, he was associated with Paul in the Evangelization of the Gentiles. Tradition places his death to have occurred in Cyprus, at the hands of the Jews. Tillemont and others have rejected the genuineness of this Epistle. It is not our intention here to defend such genuineness. It is of value to us in making known to us the use of Scripture of the first century.

the Romans XVI. 14: "Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Her-
mas," hence the book was regarded by some as canonical
Scripture. It is joined to the other Scriptures in Codex N
of Mt. Sinai. Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen
reputed it divine Scripture. It was declared apocryphal in
the Canon of Gelasius. It has always been considered a
treatise valuable for Christian erudition. Its author's iden-
tity will always remain uncertain, but the document makes
for our scope by showing the Christian tradition of the age
immediately succeeding the Apostolic times. It is called
the Pastor, because in it an angel, under the form of a shep-
herd, speaks. Its trend is chiefly parenetic.

Ecclesiasticus XXVIII. 3.	Pastor, Similitudo IX. 23.
"Homo homini reservat iram, et a Deo quærit mede- lam."	"Deus et Dominus noster, qui dominatur omnium rerum, et creaturæ suæ universæ habet potestatem, offensas memi- nisse non vult, sed ab his qui peccata sua confitentur facile placatur. Homo vero, cum et languidus, mortalis, infir- mus sit repletus peccatis, ho- mini perseveranter irascitur."

The works attributed to St. Dionysius, the Areopagite,
employ deuterocanonical Scripture.*

*Dionysius the Areopagite was a citizen of Athens, at the time that Paul preached the Gospel of Christ in that city. He was among the first men of the city, a member of the highest judicial court, called "*Ἀρειος πάγος*," Hill of Mars, from its location over against the Acropolis, on the West side. Before this tribunal, Paul was taken to be judged, for his doctrine, Acts XVII. By his preaching in that assembly, he converted Dionysius. In the Roman Breviary, the feast of Dionysius is placed on the 9th of October, and he is there declared to have been sent by Pope Clement as bishop of Paris. The falsity of this opinion has been proven by the labors of the Bollandists and others. We find the first statement of the identity of the Areopagite and Bishop Dionysius of Paris in the work which the Abbot Hilduinus compiled at the command of Louis, the Pious, in the year 835 of the Christian era. In the obscure writings of Hilduinus, we find it positively stated that Dionysius, the Areopagite, was the Bishop of Paris; though, at the same time, he mentions the doubts of those who refused to believe this. It seems that Hilduinus was a man of no critical acumen, and was deceived into his error by the anonymous Acts of the Passion of St. Dionysius, published about the

The works, *De Cœlesti Hierarchia*, *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, *De Divinis Nominibus*, *De Mystica Theologia*, and some Epistles, have been accredited to Dionysius. The Bollandists maintain as the more probable opinion that these works are not the genuine productions of the Areopagite. Their value as patristic testimonies is independent of his authorship, since certainly they reflect the tradition of the first ages of the Church.

Sap. VIII. 2.

"Hanc amavi, et exquisivi
a juventute mea, et quaesivi
sponsam mihi eam assumere,
et *amator factus sum formæ
illius.*"

De Div. Nom. IV. 12.

"Et in iis quæ aditum ad
Scripturam præparant quem-
dam invenies de divina Sa-
pientia agentem: *Amator fac-
tus sum formæ illius.*"

Sap. VIII. 1.

"Attingit ergo a fine usque
ad finem fortiter, et disponit
omnia suaviter."

De Div. Nom. VII. 4.

"Et quia (Deus) per omnia
meat pervadens, ut ait *Scrip-
tura, usque ad finem omnium.*"

middle of the eighth century. The Bollandists have clearly proven that all the Founts of Hilduinus were spurious. It is certain, then, that the opinion of the identity of the Areopagite and the Bishop of Paris was unknown before the middle of the eighth century, and that it had then no good foundation. It results from the voluminous testimonials adduced by the Bollandists that from the earliest times, the Greeks recognized that the Bishop of Paris and the Areopagite were different persons, and such opinion seems to have obtained with the Latins prior to the eighth century. One positive proof that Dionysius did not become the Bishop of Paris is in a canon of the Synod of Sardis, held in the year 347, which affirms as follows: "Nullus in hac re inventus est episcopus qui de majori civitate ad minorem transiret." This plainly establishes that, up to the year 347, no bishop had ever been transferred from a greater to a less see. Therefore, Dionysius was not transferred from Athens to Paris at that time, which was so small as to be called by Julian the Apostate *πολίχνη*, "*oppidum*," and by his historian Ammonius Marcellinus "*Castellum Parisiorum*." Finally, the identity is clearly disproven by the fact that Dionysius, the bishop of Paris, came with Rusticus and Eleutherius to Paris, in the reign of Decius, about the year 250 A. D., as is clearly proven by the Bollandists. This is centuries after the period of Dionysius, the contemporary of St. Paul. We conclude, therefore, that the distinction between these two persons is a clearly proven fact.

In the Epistle of St. Dionysius to Demophilus, it is evident that he alludes to the angel in Tobias, when he speaks in the first chapter of the "beneficis angelis de quibus theologia quædam tradit."

St. Polycarp, the martyr bishop of Smyrna, in his Epistle to the Philippians incorporates a clear quotation from Tobias.

Polycarp Epist. ad Philip-
penses X.

Tobias XII. 9.

"*Quoniam eleemosyna a morte liberat, et ipsa est quæ purgat peccata, et facit invenire misericordiam et vitam æternam.*"

"Cum potestis benefacere, nolite differre, quia *eleemosyna a morte liberat.*"

As Polycarp was a disciple of St. John the Evangelist, his use of Scripture must have been acquired under the supervision of St. John himself. This isolated quotation implies a liberal knowledge of Scripture, for the Fathers quoted from memory; such knowledge of Tobias could scarcely result from cursory readings. It must have resulted from assiduous study and use of a collection that recognized the book of Tobias as divine Scripture. Polycarp certainly reflects the teaching of his master, and we have here the implicit approbation of St. John the Evangelist.* These are but scanty data, it is true, but the Apostolic age was more the age of oral teaching than of writing. By the vicissitudes of time much of the literary product of that age has perished, and more is hid in obscurity. As when looking upon objects from afar, many are but dimly discernible, while the others are lost to the limited sense of vision; so in looking back

*Of the early history of Polycarp, we know nothing. His disciple, St. Irenæus, testifies that he was taught by the Apostles, and lived in close fellowship with many who had seen the Lord. [Adv. Haer. III. 3.] He also testifies that he was constituted bishop of Smyrna, and that he finished his life by martyrdom at a very advanced age. He is celebrated for his strict adhesion to the true doctrine, and his corresponding aversion to heresy. It is Polycarp who relates that John, his teacher, at one time, ran from the bath, wherein was Cerinthus, crying: "Let us flee, lest the bath should fall in, as long as Cerinthus, that enemy of truth, is within."

The same Polycarp, once meeting Marcion, who said: "Dost thou know us?" replied: "I recognize the first born of Satan." They stabbed him with a sword, after a futile attempt to burn him at the stake.

through the long, dim vista to the remote age of Apostolic times, we see but little with satisfying distinctness; other things appear bedimmed and shrouded by the haze of time, while many other things are entirely lost to our intellectual perception. As we recede from the remotest object of our vision, and concentrate our gaze upon nearer and nearer data, the fulness and distinctness grows with equal pace; and we must then take thought not to obtain testimonies, but to select the more fitting from the available many.

The few cited should evince to an honest mind that those who succeeded the founders of the everlasting teaching organism, recognized and used the deuterocanonical Scriptures in the same manner as the protocanonical ones. We shall now pass down through the ages, and adduce some representative testimonies of every age.

Athenagoras, a Greek writer who presented the famous *Legatio pro Christianis* to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus A. D. 177, quotes Baruch in that work.

Athenag. *Legatio pro Christianis*, (secundum Gesner, 10).

Baruch III. 36.

"Hic est Deus noster; neque est alius qui cum ipso comparetur."

"Dominus Deus noster; *non comparabitur alius ad illum.*"

St. Hippolyte wrote commentaries on the deuterocanonical fragments of Daniel, and, in his exegetical treatises, makes frequent use of the deuterocanonical works.*

*From the testimony of Photius, we know that St. Hippolyte was the disciple of Irenæus, who died about the year 202, A. D. The common opinion of the old writers makes him a bishop, but there is a great difference of opinion concerning his see. Eusebius and Jerome confess that they can establish nothing certain concerning it. Anastasius, Rom. Ecclesiæ apocrisiarius, Georgius Syncellus, Zonaras, Nicephorus Callisti, and the author of The Paschal Chronicle make him bishop of Porto in Italy, one of the suburban bishops of Rome. He is also commonly designated in the works of Greek and Latin writers as a "Roman bishop," which is confirmatory of the preceding testimonies. The greatest diversity of opinion exists among modern writers concerning his see. The Bollandists [Aug. Tom. IV., p. 510] conjecture that he was a bishop of Arabia, who was martyred at Porto on his way to Rome; that thus gradually the error arose to confound the unknown bishop with the See of Porto, where he was martyred. His see is uncertain, but his martyrdom may safely be placed under Alexander Severus, 222-235. His authorship of the Commentaries and other works from which we shall quote is undoubted.

I. Maccab. II. 33—38.

“Exite et facite secundum verbum regis Antiochi et vivetis. Et dixerunt: ‘Non exhibimus, neque faciemus verbum regis dicentes: Moriamur omnes in simplicitate nostra’ . . . et mortui sunt usque ad mille animas hominum.”

Tob. III. 24.

“In illo tempore exauditæ sunt preces amborum in conspectu gloriæ Summi Dei, et missus est Angelus ut curaret eos ambos, quorum uno tempore sunt orationes in conspectu Domini recitatæ.”

II. Maccab. VI. 7.

“Ad agitandum colendumque Bacchanaliorum solenne cogebantur Judæi hedera redimiti Baccho pompam ducere. Quod si qui minus in Græcorum ritus ac mores transire voluissent, interficerentur.”

Sap. II. 12—20.

“Circumveniamus igitur justum, quoniam inutilis est nobis, et contrarius est operibus nostris, et improperat nobis peccata legis, et diffamat in

S. Hip. Frag. in Dan. XXXI., XXXII.

“Exite et facite praeceptum regis et vivetis. Illi autem dixerunt: ‘Neque exhibimus, neque faciemus praeceptum regis: moriemur in simplicitate nostra; et interfecit ex eis mille animas hominum.’”

S. Hip. In Susannam V. 55.

“Porro ostendit, quo tempore Susanna ad Deum oravit, fuitque exaudita, missum ei fuisse angelum qui eum adjuvaret haud secus ac se res in Tobia et Sara habuit; ambobus enim eadem die eademque hora orantibus, exaudita est amborum oratio, missusque est angelus Raphael qui eos sanaret.”

S. Hip. De Christo et Anti-Christo XLIX.

“Nam et ille decretum tulit . . . cunctis immolatu-
ros atque hedera coronatos Baccho circuituros. Qui nolint parere, hos cruciatibus atque tormentis exagitatos neci tradendos esse. Ac si quis hæc sigillatim legere velit singulaque lustrare, in libro Machabæorum præscripta inveniet.”

S. Hip. Adv. Judæos, IX.

“Producam in medio etiam *prophetiam* Salomonis de Christo, quæ aperto et perspicue quæ Judæos spectant edisserit. Ait enim Propheta:

nos peccata disciplinæ nostræ. Promittit se scientiam Dei habere, et filium Dei se nominat. Factus est nobis in traductionem cogitationum nostrarum. Gravis est nobis etiam ad videndum, quoniam dissimilis est aliis vita illius, et immutata sunt viæ ejus. Tamquam nugaces aestimati sumus ab illo, et abstinere se a viis nostris tamquam ab immunditiis; et præfert novissima justorum, et gloriatur patrem se habere Deum. Videamus ergo si sermones illius veri sint, et tentemus quæ ventura sunt illi, et sciemus quæ erunt novissima illius. Si enim est verus filius Dei, suscipiet illum, et liberabit eum de manibus contrariorum. Contumelia et tormento interrogemus eum, ut probemus patientiam illius. sciamus reverentiam ejus, et probemus patientiam illius. Morte turpissima condemnemus eum: erit enim ei respectus ex sermonibus illius."

Sap. V. 1.

"Tunc stabunt justi in magna constantia adversus eos qui se angustiaverunt et qui abstulerunt labores eorum. Videntes turbabuntur timore horribili, et mirabuntur in subitatione insperatae salutis, dicentes intra se, poenitudine affecti et prae angustia spiritus

Non recte cogitaverunt impii de Christo, dicentes: Circumveniamus justum, quoniam inutilis est nobis et contrarius est operibus et sermonibus nostris, et impropere nobis peccata legis; et promittit se scientiam Dei habere, et Filium Dei se nominat. Postea dicit: Gravis est nobis etiam ad videndum, quoniam dissimilis est aliis vita illius, et immutata sunt viæ ejus. Tamquam nugaces aestimati sumus ab illo et abstinere se a viis nostris tamquam ab immunditiis, et præfert novissima justorum. . . . Ait igitur iterum Salomon in persona Judæorum de hoc justo qui est Christus: Factus est nobis in traductionem cogitationum nostrarum, et gloriatur Patrem se habere Deum. Videamus ergo si sermones illius veri sint, et tentemus quæ erunt novissima illius. Si enim est justus Dei filius, suscipiet illum, liberabit illum de manibus contrariorum. Morte turpissima condemnemus eum: erit enim respectus ejus ex sermonibus illius."

S. Hip. Adv. Judæos, X.

"Et iterum Solomon de Christo et Judæis dicit quod, quando stabit justus in magna constantia ante faciem eorum qui eum affixerunt et sermones ejus repudiarunt: Videntes turbabuntur timore horribili, et mirabuntur in subitatione insperatae salutis, et dicent

gementes: Hi sunt quos habuimus aliquando in derisum et in similitudinem improperii. Nos insensati vitam illorum aestimabamus insaniam et finem illorum sine honore: ecce quomodo computati sunt inter filios Dei, et inter sanctos sors illorum est. Ergo erravimus a via veritatis, et justitiae lumen non luxit nobis, et sol intelligentiae non est ortus nobis. Lassati sumus in via iniquitatis et perditionis, et ambulavimus vias difficiles, viam autem Domini ignoravimus. Quid nobis profuit superbia? aut divitiarum jactantia quid contulit nobis? Transierunt omnia illa tamquam umbra, et tamquam nuntius percurrens."

Baruch III. 36—38.

"Hic est Deus noster, neque est alius qui cum ipso comparetur. Hic adinvenit omnem viam disciplinae, et tradidit illam Jacob puero suo et Israel dilecto suo. Post haec, in terris visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

intra se, poenitudine affecti, et prae angustia spiritus gementes: Hic est quem habuimus aliquando in derisum et in similitudinem improperii. Nos insensati vitam illius existimabamus insaniam et finem illius sine honore. Quomodo computatus est in filiis Dei, et in sanctis sors illius est? Ergo erravimus a via veritatis; et justitiae lumen non luxit nobis, et sol non ortus est nobis. Lassati sumus in via iniquitatis et perditionis. Ambulavimus vias difficiles; viam autem Domini ignoravimus. Quid nobis profuit superbia nostra? Transierunt omnia illa tamquam umbra."

S. Hip. Contra Noet.

"Dicit Scriptura in alio loco; Hic est Deus; non reputabitur alius ad eum. . . . Invenit omnem viam scientiae, et dedit illam Jacob puero suo et Israel dilecto suo. . . . Post hæc in terra visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

In the *Constitutiones Apostolicæ*, we find the following quotations or equivalent allusions: Ecclesiasticus, eight times; Judith, four times; Wisdom, four times; Tobias, once; I. Maccab., once.

Irenæus, the stern defender of the Catholic truth against heresy, is a certain advocate of the deuterocanonical books.*

*St. Irenæus was a native of Greece, in the first half of the second century of the Christian era. He was a disciple of Polycarp, and was sent to Gaul in 157 A. D. He was, at first, priest at the church at Lyon, and, afterwards, bishop of that see. He made of that city the most

Dan. XIV. 3—4.

"Porro Daniel adorabat Deum suum. Dixitque ei rex: quare non adoras Bel? Qui respondens ait ei: Quia non colo idola manufacta, sed viventem Deum qui creavit Cœlum et terram, et habet potestatem omnis carnis."

Ibid. 23—24.

"Et dixit rex Daniel: Ecce nunc non potes dicere quia iste non sit Deus vivens: adora ergo eum.

"Dixitque Daniel: Dominum Deum meum adorabo, quia ipse est Deus vivens; iste autem non est Deus vivens."

Dan. XIII. 20.

"Ecce ostia pomarii clausa sunt, et nemo nos videt."

Dan. XIII. 52—53.

"Inveterate dierum malorum, nunc venerunt peccata tua quae operabar prioribus; iudicans iudicia injusta, innocentes opprimens, et dimittens noxios, dicente Domino: in-

Contra Hæreses, Lib. IV. 5.

"Quem (Deum) et Daniel Propheta, cum dixisset ei Cyrus rex Persarum: '*Quare non adoras Bel?*' annuntiavit dicens; quoniam non colo idola manufacta, sed vivum Deum, qui constituit Cœlum et terram, et habet omnis carnis dominationem. Iterum dixit: Dominum Deum meum adorabo, quoniam hic est Deus vivus."

Iren. Contra Hæreses, Lib.

IV. XXVI. 3.

"Qui vero crediti quidem sunt a multis esse *presbyteri, serviunt autem suis voluptatibus . . . et dicunt: nemo nos videt.*"

Iren. Contra Hæreses Lib.

Iv. XXVI. 3.

"Audient eas quae sunt a Daniele Propheta voces: *Semen Chanaan* et non Juda, species seduxit te, et concupiscentia evertit cor tuum; inveterate dierum malorum, nunc ad-

flourishing center of Catholicity in all Gaul. His erudition was vast and precise. He advocated moderation in the schism of the Asiatic bishops under Pope Victor I. The influence of Papias drew him into the error of the mitigated Millenarianism. His chief work is his Treatise against Heresies, in five books. He was martyred in the fifth general persecution in 202. By the testimony of Eusebius, he recognized the epistle to the Hebrews and Wisdom, and quoted from them. [Hist. Eccles. V. 36.] We shall collate a few passages. In the fourth book *Contra Hæreses*, we find scriptural use of the deuterocanonical fragments of Daniel.

nocentem et justum non interficies.

Ibid. 56.

"Semen Chanaan et non Juda, species decepit te, et concupiscentia subvertit cor tuum."

Sap. VI. 19—20.

"Custoditio autem legum consummatio incorruptionis est, incorruptio autem facit esse proximum Deo."

Baruch IV. 36—V.

"Circumspice, Jerusalem, ad orientem et vide jucunditatem a Deo tibi venientem. Ecce enim veniunt filii tui quos dimisisti dispersos; veniunt collecti ab oriente usque ad occidentem, in verbo Sancti gaudentes in honorem Dei."

Cap. V. Exue te, Jerusalem, stola luctus et vexationis tuæ, et indue te decore et honore ejus quæ a Deo tibi est sempiternæ gloriæ. Circumdabit te Deus diploide justitiæ, et imponet mitram capiti honoris æterni. Deus enim ostendet splendorem suum in te, omni qui sub cœlo est. Nominabitur enim tibi nomen tuum a Deo in sempiternum; pax justitiæ et honor pietatis. Exsurge, Jerusalem, et sta in excelso, et circumspice ad orientem, et vide collectos filios tuos ab oriente sole usque ad

venerunt peccata tua quæ faciebas antea, judicans iudicia injusta; et innocentes quidem damnaabas; dimittebas vero nocentes, dicente Domino: Innocentem et justum non occides."

Ibid. XXXVIII. 3.

"Visio autem Dei efficax incorruptionis est; incorruptio autem proximum facit esse Deo."

Iren. Contra Hæreses Lib. V. XXXV. 1.

"Hoc significavit Jeremias propheta:* Circumspice, dicens, ad orientem, Jerusalem et vide laetitiam quæ adventat tibi ab ipso Deo. Ecce venient filii tui quos emisisti, venient collecti ab oriente usque ad occidentem verbo illius sancti, gaudentes ea quæ a Deo tuo est claritate. Exuere Jerusalem, habitum luctus et afflictionis tuæ, et induere decorem ejus quæ a Deo tuo est claritatis in æternum. Circumdare amictum duplicem ejus quæ a Deo tuo est justitiæ, impone mitram super caput tuum gloriæ æternæ. Deus enim demonstrabit ei quæ sub cœlo est universæ tuum fulgorem. Vocabitur namque nomen tuum ab ipso Deo in æternum, pax justitiæ et gloriæ colenti Deo. Surge, Jerusalem, et sta in ex-

*Baruch was by many considered an integral part of Jeremias.

occidentem, in verbo sancti gaudentes Dei memoria. Exierunt enim abs te pedibus ducti ab inimicis: adducet autem illos Dominus ad te portatos in honore sicut filios regni. Constituit enim Deus humiliare omnem montem excelsum et rupes perennes et convalles replere in aequalitatem terræ ut ambulet Israel diligenter in honorem Dei. Obumbraverunt autem et silvæ et omne lignum suavitatis Israel ex mandato Dei. Adducet enim Deus Israel cum jucunditate in lumine majestatis suæ, cum misericordia et justitia quæ est ex ipso."

celso, et circumspice ad orientem, et vide collectos filios tuos a solis ortu usque ad occidentem, verbo illius sancti gaudentes, ipsam Dei recordationem.

"Profecti sunt enim a te pedites dum adducerentur ab inimicis. Introducet illos Deus ad te portatos cum gloria tamquam thronum regni. Decrevit enim Deus ut humilietur omnis mons excelsus et congeries æternæ, et ut valles impleantur ad redigendam planitiem terræ, ut ambulet Israel tuti Dei gloria. Umbracula autem intexuerunt silvæ, et omne lignum boni odoris ipsi Israel, præcepto Dei. Præibit enim Deus cum laetitia, lumine claritatis suæ cum misericordia et justitia quæ ab ipso est."

Clement of Alexandria has drawn a large part of his scriptural references from deuterocanonical sources.*

Ecclesiasticus XXI. 7.

"Qui odit correptionem, vestigium est peccatoris; et qui timet Deum, convertetur ad cor suum."

Clem. Paed. VIII.

"Scripturam perperam intelligentes quæ sic dicit: Et qui timet Dominum convertetur ad cor suum."

*Clement of Alexandria was a Platonic philosopher of Alexandria. He was converted by St. Pantenus, who was at the head of the Alexandrian school in the latter half of the second century. After the death of Pantenus, Clement became chief of this famous school in 190, A. D. Origen was one of his pupils. He died about the year 217, A. D. His chief works are *Cohortatio ad Gentes*, *Pædagogus*, *Στρώματα* or *Miscellanea*, *Quis Dives Salvetur*, and *Fragments*. Among all these, the *Stromata* are the most famous. Clement is the great representative of Alexandrian tradition.

Sap. XI. 25.

"Nihil odisti eorum quæ fecisti: nec enim odiens aliquid constituisti aut fecisti."

Eccli. XXII. 6-8.

"Flagella et doctrina in omni tempore sapientia. Qui docet fatuum, quasi qui conglutinat testam. Qui narrat verbum non audienti, quasi qui excitat dormientem de gravi somno."

Eccli. XXXIV. 14, 15.

"Spiritus timentium Deum quæritur, et in respectu illius benedicetur. Spes enim illorum in salvantem illos et oculi Dei in diligentes se."

Eccli. I. 27, 28.

"Timor Domini expellit peccatum, nam qui sine timore est non potest justificari."

Ibid. 22.

"Corona sapientiæ, timor Domini, replens pacem et salutis fructum."

Eccli. XVI. 13.

"Secundum misericordiam suam, sic correptio illius hominem secundum opera sua iudicat."

Ibid. 12.

"Misericordia enim et ira est cum illo; potens exoratio et effundens iram."

Clem. Paed. Ibid.

"Nihil enim est quod odio habet Dominus."

Clem. Ibid.

"Flagella enim et disciplina in omni tempore sapientia. Qui testam conglutinat, et stultum docet ad sensum, inquit. . . . Propterea aperte subjunxit: Excitans dormientem e profundo somno, qui est ex aliis omnibus maxime morti similis."

Clem. Ibid.

"Quoniam spiritus timens Dominum vivet. Spes enim est in eum qui ipsos salvos facit."

Clem. Paed. Lib. I. VIII.

"*Timor enim Domini peccata extrudit: Qui est autem sine timore non poterit justificari, inquit Scriptura.*"

Ibid.

"*Corona itaque sapientiæ, inquit Sapientia, timor Domini.*"*

Ibid.

"*Virum, inquit, secundum opera sua iudicabit.*"

Ibid.

"De eo quoque aperte dicit Sap.: Misericordia enim et ira cum ipso. Dominus enim his utrisque solus est potens, iram

*Ecclesiasticus was frequently termed by the Fathers Sapientia Sirach.

Eccli. VII. 25, 26.

"Filii tibi sunt? erudi illos, et curva illos a pueritia illorum. Filiae tibi sunt? conserva corpus illarum, et non ostendas hilarem faciem tuam ad illas."

Eccli. XXXII. 21.

"Peccator homo vitabit correptionem, et secundum voluntatem suam inveniet comparisonem."

Eccli. XVIII. 13, 14; XVI. 12.

Baruch IV. 4.

"Beati sumus, Israel, quia quæ Deo placent manifesta sunt nobis."

Baruch III. 9.

"Audi, Israel, mandata vitae: auribus percipe ut scias prudentiam."

Baruch III. 13.

"Nam si in via Dei ambulasses, habitasses utique in pace sempiterna."

Eccli. XXXIII. 6.

"Equus emissarius, sic et amicus subsannator, sub omni supersedente hinnit."

effundens ad propitiationem ex magna sua misericordia. Ita etiam ejus reprehensio."

Clem. Paed. Lib. I. Cap. IX.

"Sunt tibi filii? Castiga eos, suadet Sapientia, et inflecte eos a juventute sua. Sunt tibi filiae attende corpori earum, et ne vultum tuum apud eas exhilaveris."

Clem. Paed. Lib. I. Cap. IX.

"— quoniam peccator homo fugit reprehensionem."

Clem. Paed. Lib. I. Cap. IX.

Clem. Paed. Lib. I. X.

"Jam quoque per Jeremiam enarrat prudentiam: Beati sumus, Israel, dicens, quod quæ Deo grata sunt, a nobis cognita sunt."

Ibid.

"Audi, Israel, mandata vitae, ausculta ut cognoscas prudentiam."

Ibid.

"Quinetiam . . . per Jeremiam hortatur (pædagogus) dicens: Via Dei si ambulasses, habitasses in pace in saeculum."

Clem. Paed. Lib. I. XIII.

"Hinc etiam dicit Sapientia: Equus ad coitum libidinosus, et adulter irrationali jumento assimilatus; et ideo subjungit: Quocumque super eum sedente hinnit."

Sap. VI. 19.

"Cura ergo disciplinae dilectio est, et dilectio custodia legum illius est; custoditio autem legum consummatio incorruptionis est."

Sap. XVI. 26.

"— ut scirent filii tui quos dilexisti, Domine, quoniam non nativitatis fructus pascunt homines, sed sermo tuus, hos qui in te crediderint conservat."

Eccli. XVIII. 32. (juxta Græcum.)

"Ne delecteris multis deliciis."

Eccli. XXXI. 36-38.

"Exultatio animae et cordis, vinum moderate potatum.

"38. Vinum multum potatum irritationem et iram et ruinas multas facit."

Eccli. XXXI. 31.

"Ignis probat ferrum durum; sic vinum corda superbiorum arguet in ebrietate potatum."

Ibid. 30. (juxta Græcum.)

"In vino virum ne te exhibeas: vinum enim multos perdidit."

Clem. Paed. Lib. II. Cap. I.

"Cura autem disciplinae est caritas, quam dicit Sapientia, caritas vero observatio legum est."

Ibid.

"Discant, inquit, filii tui quos dilexisti, Domine, quod non generationes fructuum nutriant hominem, sed verbum tuum eos qui tibi credunt conservat."

Clem. Paed. Lib. II. Cap. I.

"Ne laeteris autem propter execrandas delicias, dicit Sapientia."

Ibid. Cap. II.

"Illud ergo bene dictum est: Exultatio animæ et cordis vinum creatum est ab initio, si quantum satis est bibatur."

Ibid.

"Atque ante tragoediam clamavit Sapientia: 'Vinum quod bibitur multum in irritatione et omni lapsu replet.'"

Clem. Ibid.

"Praeclare profecto dictum est: Fornacem quidem inter tingendum probare ferri aciem, vinum autem cor superbiorum."

Clem. Ibid.

"In vino, inquit, ne te virum fortem praebeas; multos enim vinum reddidit inutiles."

Eccli. XXVI. 11.

"Mulier ebriosa ira magna, et contumelia et turpitudine illius non tegetur."

Eccli. XXXI. 23.

"Vigilia, cholera et tortura viro infrunito."

Baruch III. 16-19.

"Ubi sunt principes gentium? et qui dominatur super bestias quae sunt super terram? qui in avibus coeli ludunt? qui argentum thesaurizat et aurum in qua confidunt homines, et non est finis acquisitionis eorum? qui argentum fabricant et solliciti sunt, nec est inventio operum illorum? Exterminati sunt, et ad inferos descenderunt et alii loco eorum surrexerunt."

Eccli. XXI. 23.

"Fatuus in risu exaltat vocem suam; vir autem sapiens vix tacite ridebit."

Eccli. XX. 5.

"Est tacens qui invenitur sapiens, et est odibilis, qui procax est ad loquendum."

Ibid. 8.

"Qui multis utitur verbis laedet animam suam; et qui potestatem sibi sumit injuste, odietur."

Ibid.

"Ira autem, inquit, magna est mulier ebria. . . quoniam suam non celat turpitudinem."

Ibid.

"Labor autem vigiliæ, inquit, et bilis et tormentum est cum homine insatiabili."

Clem. Paed. Lib. II. Cap. III.

"Pulcherrime itaque alicubi dicit *divina Scriptura*, ad eos qui sunt sui amantes et arrogantes verba dirigens: Ubi sunt qui gentibus imperabant et qui dominabantur feris quae sunt super terram? qui in coeli avibus illudebant: qui argenti et auri thesauros congregabant in quibus homines habebant fiduciam, et non est finis acquisitionis eorum? qui aurum et argentum fabricabantur et erant solliciti? non est inventio operum illorum. Evanuerunt, et ad inferos descenderunt."

Clem. Paed. Lib. II. Cap. V.

"Stultus autem in risu extollit vocem suam, inquit Scriptura: vir autem astutus vix sensim subridebit."

Clem. Paed. Lib. II. Cap. VI.

"Est enim tacens qui invenitur sapiens; et est qui odio habetur ob multam loquacitatem."

Ibid.

"Quin etiam ipse nugator affert sibi ipsi fastidium ac satietatem: Qui enim multiplicat sermonem, odit animam suam."

Ibid. XXXI. 41.

"In convivio vini non arguas proximum, et non despicias eum in jucunditate illius."

Eccli. XIV. 1.

"Beatus vir qui non est lapsus verbo ex ore suo, et non est stimulatus in tristitia delicti."

Eccli. IX. 12.

"Cum aliena muliere ne sed eas omnino, nec accumbas cum ea super cubitum."

Ibid 13.

"—et non alterceris cum illa in vino, ne forte declinet cor tuum in illam, et sanguine tuo labaris in perditionem."

Eccli. XXXI. 19–20.

"Utere quasi homo frugi his quæ tibi apponuntur, ne, cum manducas, multum odio habearis. Cessa prior causa disciplinae, et noli nimius esse, ne forte offendas."

Eccli. XXXII. 15.

"Et hora surgendi non te trices: præcurre autem prior in domum tuam."

Eccli. XXXII. 4, 10, 11.

"Loquere, major natu; decet enim te. Adolescens, loquere in causa tua vix. Si bis interrogatus fueris, habeat caput responsum tuum."

Ibid. Cap. VII.

"In convivio autem, inquit, ne argueris proximum, et ei opprobrii sermonem ne dixeris."

Ibid.

"Beatus revera vir ille est qui non est lapsus in ore suo, vel non compunctus est in molestia peccati."

Ibid.

"Cum muliere quæ viro subjecta est ne omnino sedeas, et ne super cubitum cum ea accubueris."

Ibid.

"Et ideo subjungit: neque cum ea in vino congregiaris, ne quando inclinet cor tuum in ipsam, et sanguine tuo labatur ad interitum."

Ibid.

"Comede, inquit, ut homo quæ apponuntur; cessa autem primus disciplinæ gratia. Et si in medio plurium sederis ne ante ipsos manum porrigas."

Ibid.

"Cum est, inquit, tempus surgendi, ne sis postremus, et revertere in domum tuam."

Ibid.

"Senior, loquere in convivio, te enim decet. . . . Adolescens, tibi quoque permittit Sapientia, loquere si te opus sit, vix cum bis interrogatus fueris; sermonem autem tuum paucis in summam redige."

Eccli. IX. 25

"Terribilis est in civitate
sua vir linguosus."

Ibid.

"Terribilis est in interitu suo
vir linguosus."

Eccli. VII. 15.

"Noli verbosus esse in multitudine presbyterorum, et non iteres verbum in oratione tua."

Ibid.

"Ne nugeris in multitudine seniorum Sermonem ne iteraveris in oratione tua."

Eccli. XXXIII. 1, 2, 7.

"Honora medicum propter necessitatem; etenim illum creavit Altissimus. A Deo est enim omnis medela, et a rege accipiet donationem. In his curans mitigabit dolorem, et unguentarius faciet pigmenta suavitatis et unctiones conficiet sanitatis."

Clem. Paed. Lib. II. Cap. VIII.

"Honora autem medicum propter ejus utilitatem, inquit Scriptura. Ipsum enim creavit Altissimus. A Domino autem est medicina. Deinde subjungit: Et unguentarius faciet mistionem."

Eccli. XXXIX. 17-19.

"In voce dicit: Obaudite me, divini fructus, et quasi rosa plantata super rivos aquarum fructificate. Quasi Libanus odorem suavitatis habete. Florete flores, quasi lilium, et date odorem et frondete in gratiam, et collaudate canticum, et benedicite Dominum in operibus suis."

Clem. Paed. Lib. II. Cap. VIII.

"Exaudite me, inquit, et tamquam rosa plantata in fluentis aquarum germinate; tamquam Libanus, suavam odorem emittite, et benedicite Dominem super opera ejus."

Ibid. 31.

"Initium necessariæ rei vitæ hominum: aqua, ignis et ferrum, sal, lac, et panis similagineus, et mel et botrus uvæ et oleum et vestimentum."

Ibid.

"Dicit itaque Scriptura; Aqua, et ignis, et ferrum, et lac, simila frumenti, et mel, sanguis uvæ et oleum et vestis; hæc omnia piis ad bona sunt."

Eccli. XXIII. 6.

“Aufer a me ventris concupiscentias, et concubitus concupiscentiæ ne apprehendant me, et animæ irreverenti et infrunitæ ne tradas me.”

Eccli. XXIII. 25.

“Omnis homo qui transgreditur lectum suum contemnens in animam suam et dicens: quis me videt? Tenebræ circumdant me, et parietes coope-riunt me, et nemo circumspicit me; quem vereor? Delictorum meorum non memorabitur Altissimus. 28.—et non cognovit quoniam oculi Domini multo plus lucidiores sunt super solem, circumspicientes omnes vias hominum, et profundum abyssi, et hominum corda intuentes in absconditas partes.”

Eccli. XVIII. 30.

“Post concupiscentias tuas non eas, et a voluntate tua avertere.”

Eccli. XIX. 2-3.

“Vinum et mulieres apostatare faciunt sapientes, et arguent sensatos, et qui se jungit fornicariis erit nequam; putredo et vermes hæreditabunt illum.”

Eccli. XI. 4.

“In vestitu ne glorieris unquam, nec in die honoris tui extollaris.”

Clem. Paed. Lib. II. Cap. X.

“Quocirca amove a servis tuis spes inanes et indecoras, inquit, cupiditates averte a me. Ventris appetitio et coitus ne me apprehendant.”

Clem. Paed. Lib. II. Cap. X.

“Homo qui ascendit super lectum suum, qui dicit in animo: Quis me videt? circa me sunt tenebræ, et parietes sunt tegumenta mea, et nemo aspicit peccata mea. Quid vereor, ne meminerit Altissimus? Nescit enim, Scriptura dicit, oculi Domini Altissimi quanto sint soli splendidiore qui respiciunt omnes vias hominum, et partes occultas intelligunt.”

Clem. Paed. Lib. II. Cap. X.

“Post tua desideria ne ambules et acearis a tuis appetitionibus. Vinum enim et mulieres faciunt sapientes deficere, et qui adhæret meretricibus evadet audacior. Putredo et vermis erunt ejus hæredes et efferetur in majori ludibrio.”

Ibid.

“In amictu vestis ne glorieris, neque in omni gloria quæ est præter leges efferaris.”

Eccli. XXV. 8.

"Corona senum multa peritia; et gloria illorum, timor Dei."

Eccli. IX. 7.

"Noli circumspicere in vicis civitatis, nec oberraveris in plateis illius."

Eccli. XI. 31.

"Non omnem hominem inducas in domum tuam, multæ enim sunt insidiæ dolosi."

Eccli. IX. 22.

"Viri justi sint tibi convivæ, et in timore Dei sit tibi gloria-tio."

Eccli. XXI. 24.

"Ornamentum aureum prudenti, doctrina, et quasi brachiale in brachio dextro."

Eccli. XXVI. 12.

"Fornicatio mulieris in extollentia oculorum, et in palpebris illius agnoscetur."

Eccli. IX. 8, 9.

"Averte faciem tuam a muliere compta, et ne circumspicias speciem alienam. Propter speciem mulieris multi perierunt, et ex hoc concupiscentia quasi ignis exardescit."

Clem. Paed. Lib. III. Cap. III.

"Senum autem corona, inquit Scriptura, est multa experientia."

Clem. Paed. Lib. III. Cap. IV.

"Ne circumspicias autem, inquit, in vicis civitatis, nec erres in ejus solitudinibus."

Ibid.

"Unde Scriptura constanter admonet: Ne inducas quemvis hominem in domum tuam; dolosi enim hominis multæ sunt insidiæ."

Alibi autem: "Viri justi, inquit, sint tui convivæ, et in timore Domini tua permanebit gloriatio."

Clem. Paed. Lib. III. Cap. XI.

"Ut vult enim Scriptura; Aureus prudenti mundus est disciplina."

Ibid.

"Fornicatio autem mulieris in elevatione oculorum."

Ibid.

"Averte autem oculum a muliere gratiosa, et ne discas alienam pulchritudinem, inquit Scriptura; et si causam roges, ipsa tibi enarrabit: In pulchritudine enim mulieris multi seducti sunt, et ex ea tamquam ignis accenditur amicitia."

Eccli. I. 1.

"Omnis sapientia a Domino Deo est, et cum illo fuit semper, et est ante aevum."

Sap. I. 7.

"Quoniam spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum."

Sap. VII. 17.

"Ipse enim dedit mihi horum quæ sunt scientiam veram, ut sciam dispositionem orbis terrarum, et virtutes elementorum . . . differentias virgultorum et virtutes radicum, et quæcumque sunt absconsa et improvisa didici; omnium enim artifex docuit me Sapientia."

Eccli. XV. 10.

"Quoniam a Deo profecta est sapientia: sapientiæ enim Dei adstabit laus, et in ore fidei abundabit."

Tob. IV. 16.

"Quod ab alio oderis fieri tibi, vide, ne tu aliquando alteri facias."

Sap. III. 1.

"Justorum autem animæ in manu Dei sunt, et non tanget illos tormentum mortis."

Ibid.

"Visi sunt oculis insipientium mori, et æstimata est afflictio exitus eorum, et quod a nobis est iter, exterminium; illi autem sunt in pace. Etsi coram hominibus tormenta

Clem. Strom. Lib. I. Cap. IV.

"Quoniam omnis sapientia a Domino, et cum ipso est in saecula, ut dicit Jesu Sapientia."

Clem. Strom. Lib. I. C p. II.

"Dicit itaque in Sapientia: Ipse mihi dedit non falsam eorum quæ sunt cognitionem, ut cognoscam mundi constitutionem . . . et vires radicum . . . et quæcumque sunt occulta et operata cognovi; *quæ est enim omnium artifex me docuit Sapientia.*"

Clem. Strom. Lib. II. Cap. V.

"Merito ergo dictum est apud Salomonem: Sapientia est in ore fidelium."

Ibid. Cap. XXIII.

"Hoc breviter *Scriptura significavit dicens*: Quod odio habes, alii ne feceris."

Clem. Strom. Lib. IV. Cap. XI.

"Justorum enim animæ in manu Dei sunt, et non tanget eas tormentum."

Ibid. Cap. XVI.

"*Divina Scriptura dicit de martyribus*: 'Visi sunt oculis insipientium mori, et reputata est vexatio eorum exitus, et a nobis discessus contritio; illi vero sunt in pace. Etenim si

passi sunt, spes illorum immortalitate plena est. In paucis vexati, in multis bene disponentur quoniam Deus tentavit eos, et invenit illos dignos se. Tamquam aurum in fornace probavit illos, et quasi holocausti hostiam accepit illos et in tempore erit respectus illorum. Fulgebunt justi, et tamquam scintillæ in arundinetis discurrent. Judicabunt nationes et dominabuntur populis, et regnabit Dominus illorum in perpetuum."

in oculis hominum supplicii affecti fuerint spes eorum plena est immortalitatis. . . . Et in paucis castigati, magnis afficiuntur beneficiis, quoniam Deus tentavit eos . . . et invenit eos se dignos, ut scilicet vocentur filii. Tamquam aurum in fornace probavit eos, et tamquam solidam sacrificii oblationem excepit eos, et in tempore inspectionis eorum fulgebunt, et tamquam scintillæ in stipula percurrent. Judicabunt gentes, et dominabuntur populis, et rex eorum erit Dominus in sæcula."

Eccli. XXVII. 13.

"In medio insensatorum, serva verbum tempori; in medio autem cogitantium, assiduus esto."

Clem. Strom. Lib. V. 3.

"In medio insipientium, observa occasionem; in medio autem cogitantium, versare perpetuo."

Sap. VII. 24.

"Omnibus enim mobilibus mobilior est sapientia; attingit autem ubique propter suam munditiam."

Clem. Strom. Lib. V. Cap. XIV.

"Quibus illud Sapientiæ imposuit: Pervadit autem ac subit per omnia propter suam munditiam."

Sap. VI. 8.

"Non enim subtrahet personam cujusquam Deus, nec verebitur magnitudinem cujusquam; quoniam pusillum et magnum ipse fecit, et æqualiter cura est illi de omnibus."

Clem. Strom. Lib. VI. Cap. VI.

"Non enim personam respicit et reveretur qui est omnium Dominus: neque curabit magnitudinem, quoniam ipse fecit magnum et parvum, et similiter omnibus providet, et omnium curam gerit."

Sap. IX. 17, 18.

"Consilium enim tuum quis sciet, nisi tu dederis sapientiam, et miseris spiritum sanctum tuum de Altissimis? et sic correctæ sint semitæ eorum qui sunt in terris et quæ tibi placent didicerint homines."

Sap. VI. 11.

"Qui enim custodierint iusta juste justificabuntur, et qui didicerint ista invenient quid respondeant."

Sap. VII. 16.

"In manu enim illius et nos, et sermones nostri, et omnis sapientia, et operum scientia et disciplina."

Ibid. 28.

"Neminem enim diligit Deus, nisi eum qui cum sapientia inhabitat."

Sap. XIV. 2, 3.

"Illud enim cupiditas acquirendi excogitavit, et artifex fabricavit sapientia sua. Tua autem, Pater, providentia gubernat—."

Sap. VIII. 9.

"Et si iustitiam quis diligit, labores hujus magnas habent virtutes, sobrietatem enim et prudentiam docet et iustitiam

Clem. Strom. Lib. VI. Cap. XI.

"Veritas autem per Dominum: 'Consilium enim tuum, inquit, quis novit, si non tu dederis sapientiam, et miseris sanctum tuum Spiritum ab altissimis, et ita correctæ fuerint viæ eorum qui sunt in terra, et didicerint homines ea quæ tibi placent, et salvi fuerint sapientia.'"

Ibid.

"Qui enim sancta, inquit, sancte servant sanctificabuntur, et qui ea didicerint inveniunt responsionem."

Ibid.

"Et rursus licet audire: 'In manu enim ejus, hoc est, virtute et sapientia, et nos et verba nostra, et omnis prudentia et operum scientia. Nihil enim diligit Deus nisi eum qui cohabitat cum sapientia. Præterea autem non legerunt quod dictum est a Salomone. Nam cum de templi constructione tractasset, aperte dicit: Artifex autem construxit sapientia; tua autem, Pater, gubernat providentia.'"

Ibid.

"Et si quis diligit iustitiam, labores ejus sunt virtutes; temperantia enim et prudentia docet iustitiam et fortitudinem

et virtutem, quibus utilius nihil est in vita hominibus, et nescierunt sacramenta Dei. . . quoniam Deus creavit hominem inexterminabilem, et ad imaginem similitudinis suæ fecit illum."

Tob. XII. 8.

"Bona est oratio cum jejunio, et eleemosyna magis quam thesauros auri recondere."

Sap. IV. 17.

"Videbunt enim finem sapientis, et non intelligent quid cogitaverit de illo Deus, et quare munierit illum Dominus."

Ibid. Cap. V. 3.

"—dicentes intra se, pœnitentia acti et præ angustia spiritus gementes: hi sunt quos habuimus aliquando in derisum, et in similitudinem improperii; nos insensati vitam illorum æstimabamus insaniam, et finem illorum sine honore: ecce quomodo computati sunt inter filios Dei, et inter sanctos sors illorum est."

Eccli. XVIII. 8.

"Numerus dierum hominum, ut multum, centum anni; quasi gutta aquæ maris deputati sunt, et sicut calculus arenæ, sic exigui anni in die ævi."

quibus nihil est in vita hominibus utilius."

Clem. Strom. Lib. VI. Cap. XII.

"Sed, ut videtur, Dei non novere mysteria, quod, scilicet, Deus creavit hominem ob immortalitatem, et fecit eum imaginem suæ proprietatis."

Ibid.

"Exaudiens Scripturam quæ dicit: 'Bonum est jejunium cum oratione.'"

Clem. Strom. Lib. VI. Cap. XIV.

"Videbunt enim mortem sapientis, et non intelligent quid de eo decreverit, et ad quid eum stabilierit Dominus, et dicent de ejus gloria: 'Is est quem aliquando habuimus in derisum et in parabolam opprobrii insipientes. Vitam ejus existimavimus insaniam, et mortem ejus ignominiosam. Quomodo est enumeratus inter filios Dei, et in sanctis est sors ejus.'"

Ibid.

"Reputati sunt, inquit, ut pulvis terræ, et ut gutta ex cado."

Sap. III. 9.

"Qui confidunt in illo, intelligent veritatem, et fideles in dilectione acquiescent illi."

Sap. III. 14.

"—dabitur enim illi fidei donum electum, et sors in templo Dei acceptissima."

Sap. VI. 13-21.

"Clara est et quæ nunquam marcescit sapientia, et facile videtur ab his qui diligunt eam, et invenietur ab his qui quærunt illam. Præoccupat qui se concupiscunt ut illis se prior ostendat. Qui de luce vigilaverit ad illam non laborabit, assidentem enim illum foribus suis inveniet. Cogitare ergo de illa sensus est consummatus, et qui vigilaverit propter illum cito securus erit. Quoniam dignos se ipsa circuit quærens, et in viis ostendit se illis hilariter, et in omni providentia occurrit illis. Initium enim illius verissima est disciplinæ concupiscentia. Cura ergo disciplinæ dilectio est, et dilectio custodia legum illius est; custoditio autem legum consummatio incorruptionis est; incorruptio autem facit esse proximum Deo. Concupiscentia itaque sapientiæ deducit ad regnum perpetuum."

Ibid.

"Merito ergo dictum est: 'Et qui in ipso confidunt, intelligent veritatem, et fideles in dilectione in ipso permanent.'"

Ibid.

"Ecce enim Salomon: Dabitur enim ei, inquit, fidei gratia electa, et sors in templo Domini jucundior."

Clem. Strom. Lib. VI. Cap. XV.

"Salomon hæc dicit: 'Clara est et non marcescit sapientia, et facile cernitur ab iis qui ipsam diligunt: eos qui cupiunt prævenit, ut præcognoscatur. Qui mane surrexerit ad ipsam non laborabit; de ipso enim cogitare est perfectio prudentiæ. Et qui propter ipsam vigilaverit cito erit cura vacuus; quoniam eos qui ipsa digni sunt, ipsa quærens circuit, et in semitis ab ipsis benevole visione apprehenditur.' Mox subjungit: 'Et in omni cogitatione occurrit ipsis . . . ejus enim principium verissimum est desiderium disciplinæ, hoc est, cognitionis; cura autem disciplinæ est dilectio; dilectio autem est observatio legum ejus; attentio autem legum est incorruptibilitatis confirmatio; incorruptibilitas autem facit ut ad Deum prope accedatur. Sapientiæ ergo desiderium attollit ad regnum.' "

Clement of Alexandria weaves the woof of his fabric from Scripture. His *Pædagogus* could be properly called a commentary on Ecclesiasticus. He uses the deuterocanonical works as *divine Scripture*; plainly terms them so; and was evidently very familiar with them. As he was the coryphæus of the Alexandrian church in that age, we can deduce from his line of action that the great Alexandrian church in the age succeeding the Apostles, received and used the deuterocanonical books with equal honor as the books of the first Canon.

Turning from the master to his greater pupil, Origen, we find him to have prosecuted the same line of teaching as Clement.*

*Origen was born of Christian parents at Alexandria in the year 185, A. D. He was surnamed Adamantius, by reason of his indefatigable application to mental toil. The vastness of his erudition is not surpassed by that of any of the Fathers of the church. He was taught by Clement of Alexandria, and, at the age of eighteen, was given the charge of the instruction of the faithful at Alexandria. To preclude the taint which calumny strove to attach to his name, he, by means of a drug, destroyed the energy of his generative organs. He was led to this move by a false literal interpretation of the praise of eunuchs by Christ, in the Gospels. Origen visited Rome, Palestine, Greece, Arabia and other lands. While in Palestine, he was deputed by the bishops to explain publicly the Holy Scripture. Demetrius, his bishop, objected to this, on the grounds that it was not fitting for a layman to teach the Holy Scriptures. Origen was afterwards ordained priest by Theoctistus, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine. Demetrius then deposed Origen on the grounds that he was a eunuch, that he had been ordained without consent of his own bishop, and that he had taught heresy. Origen was obliged to retire to Cæsarea till after the death of Demetrius in 231. Under Maximin he was cast into prison and treated with great indignity. It is charged by Epiphanius, and others, that, to escape from prison, Origen offered incense to Serapis. The data are wanting to establish either the truth or falsity of this imputation. He died at Tyre in 254. To Origen, have been imputed many pernicious errors. He was condemned by the fifth General Council, and again, Martin the Fifth anathematized him in the first Council of Lateran in 649. In that formative period, before the Christian dogmas became moulded with the precision and definiteness, which the natural development of doctrine subsequently gave them, when men strove to unite the philosophy of Plato with the divine teachings of Christ, it was not strange that a man deeply imbued with Greek thought, should in good faith, have advocated theories which closer investigation found to be untenable in the Catholic Church. Without the aid of divine revelation, it would be strange that a man should write so much on the subjects on which Origen wrote and never write amiss. These errors should not be considered as a malicious

It is impossible to give a detailed mention of his many works. Later in our book we shall treat of his great Hexapla. Other of his chief works are: Eight Books against Celsus, *De Principiis libri quattuor*, and Homilies and Commentaries on Holy Scripture.

We have thought good to transcribe and collate many citations from Origen, since the adversaries of the deuterocanonical books have alleged his authority in support of their curtailed canon. Nowhere in patristic literature do we find such copious and apposite use of Holy Scripture as in Origen. His works that have been preserved to us resemble a mosaic in which his own creations serve only as the setting in which are infixed the Scriptural gems. No discrimination is made in favor of the books of the first canon. He rejects and treats with irony the adoption of the Jewish canon. In his letter to Julius Africanus*, he defends the deuterocanonical fragments of Daniel, and implies that the canon must be sought from the authority of the Church, and not from the Jews: "Know, therefore, in answer to these things, what should be our line of action, not only concerning the history of Susanna, *which, in its Greek exemplar, circulates through the whole Church of Christ, although it does not exist with the Hebrews*; and not only concerning the other parts, which, as you have said, are written in the end of the book, namely, concerning Bel and the Dragon, which also are wanting in the Hebrew text; but also concerning many other parts, which, while we compared, according to our powers, the Hebrew

intent to infect the teachings of the Church but an evidence of the defectibility of human reason. Origen has done the Church invaluable service. and, though not ranked with the Fathers, he will always be appealed to in questions which need the testimony of tradition for their solution.

*Julius Africanus was a Christian historian, who flourished in the third century, under Heliogabalus. He was of Nicopolis, in Palestine. He is the author of a universal history from Adam down to Macrinus, whose scope was to prove that paganism was an innovation. Only fragments of the work are preserved to us by Eusebius. Africanus controverted the genuineness of the history of Susanna, concerning which he wrote to Origen. One of his most celebrated contributions to the patrimony of science is his reconciliation of the diverse genealogies of Jesus Christ in Matthew and Luke.

with our own text, we found in many places." Soon he breaks forth into irony: "Forsooth, the time is at hand, if we have discovered these things, to abrogate the exemplars of Holy Scripture of our churches, and impose the law upon the brethren that, rejecting the sacred books which they have, they, by adulation, persuade the Jews to concede to us the Scriptures pure and devoid of figment. . . . In relation to these things, consider whether it be not good to remember the saying: Pass not beyond the ancient bounds which thy fathers have set. [Prov. XXII. 28.] And I say this, not, indeed, that I, through sloth, refuse to examine the Scriptures which the Jews have, and compare them with ours, to see what diversity between them exists. This, indeed, if it be not arrogant to say, we have diligently, and, according to our ability, done; comparing with great care the editions, and observing their divergencies, thus, however, that we have bestowed somewhat more labor on the Septuagint, that we might not bring anything spurious into the Churches, which are beneath the whole heavens. . . . We endeavor not to be ignorant of the Scriptures which the Jews have, so that, discussing with them, we may not bring forth those things which are wanting in their exemplars, and we also make use of those portions which are found with them, and are not in our books."

Many of the early Fathers were forced to meet the Jews on their own ground, and thus in disputes with them, to use only the curtailed canon which the Jews recognized. Thus Jerome [Praef. on Isaiah] affirms: "May He give me my future reward who knows me to have labored and sweat in the acquisition of this foreign tongue, so that the Jews might not longer insult the Christians on the charge of the falsity of their Scriptures." This need also was the motive for the lists drawn up by some of the Fathers, in which the deutero-canonical books were excluded. Even Origen himself has made such list, but he openly declares that it is the canon *according to the Hebrews*. The Jews by their ridicule of the deutero-canonical books may have led some individual Fathers to doubt of the equality of inspiration of the books of the second canon. As the rationalists of to-day sometimes

obtain from Catholics unwarranted concessions, lest they should seem to be ignorant, so those other earlier enemies of truth may have diminished in the minds of some the authority of the deuterocanonical works. This they certainly effected in the mind of Jerome. We see that Africanus rejected the deuterocanonical fragments of Susanna. Origen describes the existing state of things very well in his response to Africanus. The complete canon circulated throughout the universal Church; the Jews and some few individuals advocated the restricted canon of the Jews. Origen in plain words ridicules the theory which the protestants of to-day advocate, and yet they would claim his authority.

Origen endorses Tobias in Hist. Susannæ, 13: "We must know, therefore, that the Hebrews use neither Tobias nor Judith. For the Hebrews have not these books even among the Apocrypha, as we ourselves have learned from them. *But since the Churches use Tobias*, we must know that also in the captivity some captives were opulent and prospered." Origen essays to defend the book of Tobias, not that the Hebrews acknowledge it, but because *the Churches use it*.

Two things result for us from Origen's testimonies. First, that the usage of the Churches of his age recognized the divinity of the deuterocanonical books; and, second, that he considered this usage a criterion of inspiration. He can never be honestly claimed to have favored the protestant theory of accepting the canon from the Jews.

The Canon of Origen is found in his Commentary on the first Psalm, Parag, I: "The twenty-two books according to the Hebrews are these." The first which is called by us Genesis is termed by them, from its opening words, Beresith which signifies "In the beginning." Then Exodus, with Hebrews, Vellesemoth, interpreted, "These are the names." The third, Leviticus, with the Hebrews, Vajikra, that is, "And he called." The fourth, Numbers, with the Hebrews Hammisphecodim.* The fifth, Deuteronomy, with the He-

*The appellation Hammisphecodim for the book of Numbers is only found in Origen. Its signification is unknown to us. The common designation of the book in Hebrew was וַיִּרְכֹּךְ, "et locutus est."

brews Elle, haddebarim, that is, "these are the words." The sixth, Jesus the son of Nave, in Hebrew, Jehoshua ben Nun. The seventh, Judges and Ruth, by the Hebrews comprised in one volume, which they call Sophetim. The eighth is the first and second book of the Kingdoms, which with them constitute one volume which is called Samuel, that is "The called of God." The ninth is the third and fourth of the Kingdoms, which they also comprise in one volume and call Vammelech David, that is, "The Kingdom of David." The tenth is the first and second of Paralipomenon, by them comprised in one volume, which they call Dibre Hajjamim, that is, "The Words of the Days." The eleventh is the first and second of Esdras, which with them constitute one volume, which they call Ezra, that is, "The Helper." The twelfth is the book of Psalms, with the Hebrews Sepher Tehillim. The thirteenth is the Proverbs of Solomon, with the Hebrews Misloth. The fourteenth is Ecclesiastes, with the Hebrew Koheleth. The fifteenth is the Canticle of Canticles, with the Hebrews Sir Hassirim. The sixteenth is Isaias, with the Hebrews Jesaia. The seventeenth is Jeremias with the Lamentation and Epistle, by them comprised in one volume, which they call Jirmia. The eighteenth is Daniel, with the Hebrews Daniel. The nineteenth is Ezekiel, with the Hebrews Jeezhel. The twentieth is Job, by the Hebrews, designated by the same name. The twenty-first is Esther, which is also thus designated by the Hebrews. Outside this enumeration are the books of Maccabees which are inscribed "Sarbet Sarbaneel."

In this list, the twelve minor Prophets, by the Hebrews comprised in one book, are omitted. It must have been, however, through inadvertence on the part of Origen or the amanuensis, since this book was never doubted. The care bestowed by Origen and other Fathers in preparing these lists was for the purpose of fitting the Christians to meet the Jews on common grounds. This was necessary in that age, when the chief intellectual attacks on Christianity came from the Jews. The following collated passages will illustrate Origen's attitude towards the deuterocanonical works:

Tob. I. 13-22.

(Already quoted.)

Orig. De Hist. Sus. 13.

(Already quoted.)

Judith XI. Passim.

Orig. Frag. Ex Lib. VI.
Strom.

"Homo autem, cui incumbit necessitas mentiendi, diligenter attendat ut sic utatur interdum mendacio quomodo condimento atque medicamine, ut servet mensuram ejus, ne excedat terminos *quibus usa est Judith contra Holophernem, et vicit* prudenti simulatione verborum."

Dan. XIII.

"Et erat vir habitans in Babylone, et nomen ejus Joakim," etc.

Orig. Ex Lib. Stromatum.

"Et erat vir habitans in Babylone, et nomen ejus Joacim, et accepit uxorem nomine Susannam, filiam Helciæ, pulchram nimis et timentem Dominum. Et parentes ejus justi edocuerunt filiam suam juxta legem Moysi.

Hoc utendum est testimonio ad exhortationem parentum, ut doceant juxta legem Dei sermonemque divinum, non solum filios, sed et filias suas. . . .

.....Quia Hebræi reprobant historiam Susannae, dicentes eam in Danielis volumine non haberi, debemus inquirere nomina *σχίψου, καὶ πρίψου* quae Latini ilicem et lentiscum interpretantur, si sint apud Hebraeos, et quam habeant etymologiam, ut a *σχίψω*, scissio, et a *πρίψω*, sectio sive seratio dicatur lingua eorum. Quod si non fuerit inventum,

necessitate cogemur et nos eorum acquiescere sententiae, qui Graeci tantum sermonis hanc volunt esse περιχώρη, quæ Graecam habeat tantum etymologiam, et Hebraicam non habeat. Quod si quis ostenderit duarum scissionis et sectionis in Hebraeo stare etymologiam, tunc poterimus etiam hanc Scripturam recipere."

Orig. De Principiis, Lib. I.

Cap. II.

Sap. VII. 25.

"Vapor est enim virtutis Dei, et emanatio quaedam est claritatis omnipotentis Dei sincera—"

"Invenimus nihilominus in Sapientia, quae dicitur Salomonis, descriptionem quamdam de Dei Sapientia hoc modo scriptam: 'Vapor est enim, inquit, virtutis Dei et ἀπόρροια gloriae omnipotentis purissima.' "

Ibid. VII. 25, 26.

Ibid.

Sap. XVIII. 24.

"In veste enim poderis, quam habebat, totus erat orbis terrarum—."

Orig. De Princ. Lib. II. Cap. III. 6.

"— sicut in Sapientia Salomonis invenimus, cum dicit quia: 'In vestimento poderis erat universus mundus.' "

Eccl. XLIII. 22.

"Frigidus ventus aquilo flavit—."

Orig. Ibid. Cap. VIII. 3.

"—sicut scriptum est in Sapientia: 'Frigidus ventus Boreas.' "

Eccl. VI. 4.

"Anima enim nequam disperdet, qui se habet."

Ibid.

"Anima mala perdit eum qui possidet eam."

Sap. XI. 21.

"— sed omnia in mensura et numero et pondere disposuisti."

Ibid. Cap. IX. 1.

"Porro autem, *sicut Scriptura dicit*: 'In numero et mensura, universa condidit Deus.—' "

Sap. VII. 16.

"—in manu enim illius et nos, et sermones nostri, et omnis Sapientia et operum scientia, et disciplina."

Eccli. XVI. 22.

"Nam plurima illius opera sunt is absconsis—."

Sap. XI. 18.

"Non enim impossibilis erat omnipotens manus tua, quae creavit orbem terrarum ex materia invisa, immittere illis multitudinem ursorum, aut audaces leones—."

Orig. De Prin, Lib. III. 14.

" 'In manu enim Dei, et nos, et sermones nostri, et omnis prudentia atque operum disciplina est' *sicut Scriptura dicit.*"

Orig. De Prin. Lib. IV. 26.

"Quia scriptum est: 'Quamplurima ex operibus Dei in secretis sunt.' "

Ibid. 33.

"In Sapientia quae dicitur Salomonis, qui utique liber non ab omnibus in auctoritate habetur. Ibi tamen scriptum invenimus hoc modo: 'Non enim,' inquit, 'deerat omnipotenti manu tuae, quae creaverat mundum ex informi materia, immittere eis multitudinem ursorum vel feroces leones.' "

Origen here records the doubts of some, without making them his own. Certain *individuals* have doubted concerning the deuterocanonical works; the *Church never doubted*. In quoting the book as *Scripture*, Origen follows the Church. This can be said in general; the Fathers, in their practical use of Scripture, reflect the belief of the Church. If they put forth, at times, speculative doubts, they are then speaking as fallible individuals. This principle has been recognized by the protestant Davidson.

"It is sometimes said that the history of the Canon should be sought from definite catalogues, not from isolated quotations. The latter are supposed to be of slight value; the former to be the result of deliberate judgment. This remark is more specious than solid. In relation to the Old Testament, the catalogues given by the Fathers, as by Meliton and Origen, rest solely on the tradition of the Jews; apart from which, they have no independent authority. As none except Jerome and Origen knew Hebrew, their lists of the Old

Testament books are simply a reflection of what they learned of others. If they deviate in practice from their masters by quoting as Scripture other than canonical (protocanonical) books, they show their judgment, overriding an external theory.

"The very men who give a list of the Jewish books, evince an inclination to the Christian and enlarged Canon. Thus the Fathers, who give catalogues of the Old Testament, show the existence of a Jewish and a Christian Canon in relation to the Old Testament; the latter wider than the former, their private opinion more favorable to the one, though the other was historically transmitted." [Davidson, Canon of the Bible, p. 132.]

This last clause is not well said. It is not the private opinions of the Fathers that constitute the basis of traditional proof of our complete Canon. It is the universal usage of the Churches of the Christian people, which subjugated even those who theoretically were disposed to doubt. It is the belief identical with the life of the Church which manifests itself in the use which these Fathers made of Scripture. As individuals they could err and doubt; as faithful witnesses of the belief of the Church, they hand down to us the faith which was the same in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be. This capacity they fulfill, as Davidson rightly says, when quoting the Scriptures as they were familiar to the Christian people. Neither is Davidson correct in saying that the curtailed canon of the Jews was historically transmitted. If he means by this that the restricted canon was transmitted to us by the Jews, it is well; but it is utterly false to say that the existing, recognized Canon of Christians were such Canon. Impartial historians, such as Eusebius, record the doubts of isolated churches concerning several books, but these doubts never could be said to have pervaded the whole Church. Such a critical mind, as was that of Origen, would have more readily tended to reject the deuterocanonical books, had he not been convinced by the belief and usage of the universal Church. As Origen's authority is most valuable, we have taken the trouble to collate many passages:

Sap. IX. 13-16.

"Quis enim hominum poterit scire consilium Dei? Aut quis poterit cogitare quid velit Deus? Cogitationes enim mortalium timidae; et incertae providentiae nostrae; corpus enim quod corrumpitur aggravat animam, et terrena inhabitatio deprimit sensum multa cogitantem, et difficile aestimamus quae in terra sunt, et quae in prospectu sunt invenimus cum labore. Quae autem in coelis sunt, quis investigabit?"

Sap. XI. 25.

"Diligis enim omnia quae sunt, et nihil odisti eorum quae fecisti—."

Sap. I. 7.

"Quoniam Spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum."

Tob. III. 24, 25.

"In illo tempore exaudita sunt preces amborum in conspectu gloriae summi Dei, et missus est angelus Domini, Sanctus Raphael, ut curaret eos ambos."

Tob. XII. 12 (juxta Graecum).

"Ac modo cum tu, et Sara nurus tua orastis, memoriam precum vestrarum coram Sancto retuli."

Orig. Lib. De Oratione, I.

"Quis enim hominum poterit scire consilium Dei? Aut quis poterit cogitare quid Deus velit? Cogitationes enim mortalium timidae; et incertae providentiae nostrae, corpus enim quod corrumpitur aggravat animam, et terrena inhabitatio deprimit sensum multa cogitantem; et difficile aestimamus quae in terra sunt. Quae autem in coelis sunt, quis investigavit?"

Ibid. 5.

"—diligitque omnia quae sunt, et nihil odit eorum quae fecit."

Ibid. 10.

"Magis idoneus fit commisceri 'Spiritui Domini qui replevit orbem terrarum.' "

Ibid. 11.

"Quae inde patent, quod Raphael obtulerit Deo rationabile obsequium Tobiae et Sarae. 'Nam post utriusque orationem, exaudita est, *inquit Scriptura*, deprecatio utrorumque coram gloria magni Raphael, et missus est ad sanandum ambos.' "

Ibid.

" 'Et nunc quando orasti tu, et nurus tua Sara, ego obtuli memoriale orationis vestrae coram Sancto.' Et post pauca

Ibid. 15 (juxta Graecum).

"Ego sum Raphael, unus ex septem sanctis Angelis qui preces sanctorum ad Deum offerunt, atque ambulant ante majestatem Sancti."

Ibid. 8 (juxta Graecum).

"Bonae sunt preces quae cum jejunio et beneficentia justitiae conjunctae sunt."

II. Maccab. XV. 13-16.

"Post hoc apparuisse et alium virum aetate et gloria mirabilem, et magni decoris habitudine circa illum; respondentem vero Oniam dixisse: Hic est fratrum amator, et populi Israel: hic est qui multum orat pro populo et universa sancta civitate, Jeremias propheta Dei. Extendisse autem Jeremiam dexteram, et dedisse Judae gladium aureum dicentem: accipe sanctum gladium, munus a Deo in quo dejicies adversarios populi mei Israel."

Judith XIII. 9-10.

"Cumque evaginasset illum, apprehendit comam capitis ejus, et ait: Confirma me, Domine Deus, in hac hora; et percussit bis in cervicem ejus, et abscidit caput ejus, et abstulit conopeum ejus a columnis, et evolvit corpus ejus truncum."

Judith VIII. 22. (juxta Graecum).

"Mementote quæ cum Abraham egerit, quibusque rebus Isaac probavit, quæ item Jacob

'Ego sum Raphael, unus ex septem Angelis qui offerunt orationes sanctorum, et ingrediuntur in conspectu gloriae Sancti.' Itaque juxta Raphaelis sermonem: 'Bonum oratio cum jejunio et eleemosyna et justitia.' Item quod Jeremias, ut in Machabaeorum libris habetur; 'apparuerit canitie et gloria eximius, ita ut mirabilis quaedam et maximi decoris fuerit praestantia circa illum: extenderitque dexteram, et dedit Judae gladium aureum, de quo testatus est alius sanctus qui ante obierat: Hic est qui multum orat pro populo et sancta civitate, Jeremias, propheta Dei.' "

Orig. De Oratione, 13.

"Judith, sanctis oblati precibus, Holophernem, Deo adjuvante, superavit, et una Hebraeorum femina labem domui Nabuchodonosoris inussit."

Orig. De Orat. 29.

"Recordamini enim," ait Judith, "quæcumque fecit cum Abraham, et quæcumque tent-

in Mesopotamia Syriæ pascenti oves Laban avunculi ipsius acciderint. Etenim sicut illos experiundi cordis ipsorum gratia, ita nos probat, et non ulciscitur; sed commonitionis causa Dominus castigat eos qui ei appropinquant."

Sap. XVI. 28.

"— ut notum omnibus esset quoniam oportet prævenire solem ad benedictionem tuam, et ad ortum lucis te adorare."

Tob. XII. 12.

(Already quoted.)

II. Maccab. VI. 19-31.

"At ille gloriosissimam mortem magis quam odibilem vitam complectens, voluntarie præibat ad supplicium. Intuens autem, quemadmodum oporteret accedere, patienter sustinens, destinavit non admittere illicita propter vitæ amorem. Hi autem, qui astabant, iniqua miseratione commoti, propter antiquam viri amicitiam, tolentes eum secreto rogabant afferi carnes, quibus vesci ei licebat, ut simularetur manducasse, sicut rex imperaverat de sacrificii carnibus: ut, hoc facto a morte liberaretur: et propter veterem viri amicitiam, hanc in eo faciebant humanitatem. At ille cogitare cœpit ætatis ac

avit Isaac, et quæcumque evenerunt Jacob in Mesopotamia Syriæ pascenti pecora Laban fratris matris suae, quoniam sicut illos examinavit in certamen cordis eorum, etiam nos ulciscitur, quia ad emendationem flagellat Dominus appropinquantes sibi."

Ibid. 31.

"— et de parte mundi, in Sapientia Solomonis, dicitur: 'Ut notum esset, quoniam oportet prævenire solem ad benedictionem tuam, et ante ortum lucis te adorare.' "

Ibid.

(Already quoted.)

Orig. Exhortatio ad Martyrium, 22.

"Quam autem æquius est mortuum laudari quam qui mortem sponte ac libere pro religione oppetiit? Qualis fuit Eleazar, qui 'gloriosissimam mortem magis quam odibilem vitam complectens, voluntarie præibat ad supplicium,' quique 'strenuam assumens ratiocinationem dignam ætate sua nonagenaria, et senectutis suæ eminentia, illustrique canitie, atque optima a pueritia educatione, maxime vero sancta, et a Deo condita lege dixit: non est ætate hac nostra dignum fingere, ut multi adolescentes, arbitantes Eleazarum nonaginta annorum transisse ad vitam alienigenarum, et ipsi prop-

senectutis suæ eminentiam dignam, et ingenitæ nobilitatis canitiem, atque a puero optimæ conversationis actus: et secundum sanctæ et a Deo conditæ legis constituta, respondit cito, dicens: Præmitti se velle in infernum. Non enim ætati nostræ dignum est, inquit; fingere; ut multi adolescentium, arbitrantes Eleazarum nonaginta annorum transisse ad vitam alienigenarum: et ipsi propter meam simulationem, et propter modicum corruptibilis vitæ tempus decipiantur, et per hoc maculam atque execrationem meæ senectuti conquiram. Nam, etsi in præsentī tempore suppliciis hominum eripiar, sed manum Omnipotentis nec vivus, nec defunctus effugiam. Quamobrem fortiter vita excedendo senectute quidem dignus apparebo; adolescentibus autem exemplum forte relinquam, si prompto animo, ac fortiter pro gravissimis ac sanctissimis legibus honesta morte perfungar. His dictis, confestim ad supplicium trahebatur. Hi autem, qui eum ducebant, et paulo ante fuerant mitiores, in iram conversi sunt propter sermones ab eo dictos, quos illi per arrogantiam prolatos arbitrabantur. Sed, cum plagis perimeretur, ingemuit, et dixit: Domine, qui habes sanctam scientiam, manifeste tu scis, quia, cum a morte possem liberari, duos corporis sustineo

ter meam simulationem,* et propter modicum corruptibilis vitæ tempus decipiantur propter me, et execrationem atque maculam senectuti acquiram; nam etsi in præsentī tempore suppliciis hominum eripiar, sed manus Omnipotentis nec vivus nec defunctus effugiam. Quamobrem fortiter excedendo senectute quidem dignus apparebo, adolescentibus autem exemplum forte relinquam, ut prompto animo ac fortiter pro gravissimis ac sanctissimis legibus honesta morte perfungantur.'

Oro autem vos cum ad portas mortis imo libertatis constituti eritis, maxime si tormenta objicientur, dicere Domino, qui sanctam habet scientiam: 'Manifestum est quia cum a morte possem liberari, duos corporis sustineo dolores, secundum animam vero propter timorem ejus libenter hæc patior.'

Talis ergo fuit Eleazari mors, 'qui non solum juvenibus, sed et plerisque suæ gentis mortem suam exemplum fortitudinis et memoriale virtutis reliquit.' "

dolores: secundum animam vero propter timorem tuum libenter hæc patior. Et iste quidem hoc modo vita decessit, non solum juvenibus, sed et universæ genti memoriam mortis suæ ad exemplum virtutis et fortitudinis derelinquens.

The 23d, 24th, 25th, 26th, and 27th numbers of the Exhortatio ad Martyrium are a commentary on the death of the mother and her seven sons, as recorded in the second book of Maccab., seventh chapter, and he concludes by saying: "I believe that I have selected these things as most useful to my scope *from the Scriptures*, that we may see how, against bitterest tortures and heaviest torments, pity and the love of God, mightier than any other love, can avail." It is evident that the faith for which the martyrs died recognized as divine Scripture the deuterocanonical books.

Sap. XV. 10.

"Cinis est enim cor ejus, et terra supervacua spes illius, et luto vilior vita ejus."

Orig. Exhort. ad Martyr. 32.

"—idque postquam cognovimus 'cinerem esse cor idolis servientium, vitamque luto turpiorem.' "

Sap. III. 6.

"Tamquam aurum in fornace probavit illos, et quasi holocausti hostiam accepit illos, et in tempore erit respectus illorum."

Ibid. 35.

"Quodsi probatus est et ille, et qui similes illi sunt; quos 'tamquam aurum in fornace' tormentis et quæstionibus 'probavit Dominus, et quasi holocausti hostiam accepit.' "

Sap. I. 4.

"Quoniam in malevolam animam non introibit sapientia, nec habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis."

Orig. Contra Celsum, Lib. III.
60.

"Quoniam vero docemus 'sapientiam in malevolam animam non introituram, nec habitaturam in corpore subdito peccatis.' "

Sap. VII. 25—26.

“Vapor est enim virtutis Dei, et emanatio quaedam est claritatis omnipotentis Dei sincera: et ideo nihil inquinatum in eam incurrit; candor est enim lucis aeternae, et speculum sine macula Dei majestatis et imago bonitatis illius.”

Sap. I. 7.

“Quoniam spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum: et hoc, quod continet omnia, scientiam habet vocis.”

Sap. XI. 25.

“Diligis enim omnia quae sunt, et nihil odisti eorum quae fecisti: nec enim odiens aliquid constituisti, aut fecisti.”

Eccli. XVIII. 12.

“—misericordia autem Dei super omnem carnem.”

Sap. XII. 1.

“O quam bonus, et suavis est, Domine, spiritus tuus in omnibus.”

Eccli. XXXIX. 26.

“Non est dicere: Quid est hoc, aut quid est istud? omnia enim in tempore suo quaerentur.”

Orig. Contra Celsum, Lib. III.
72.

“—aut quomodo illum divina Scriptura definit: ‘vapor divinae potestatis, limpida omnipotentis ejus gloriae effluentia, splendor lucis aeternae, speculum sine macula Dei majestatis, et imago bonitatis illius.’ ”

Orig. Contra Celsum, Lib. IV.
5.

“— nescit: ‘Spiritus Domini replere orbem terrarum, et hoc quod continet omnia scientiam habere vocis.’ ”

Ibid. 18.

“Legimus ac novimus: ‘Deum diligere omnia quae sunt, et nihil odisse eorum quae fecit; nihil enim constitutum fuisse quod odisset.’ ”

Ibid.

“—et misericordiam Domini esse super omnem carnem.”

Ibid. 37.

“—de quo dictum est: ‘Incorruptibilis autem tuus Spiritus est in omnibus.’ ”

Ibid. 75.

“Ne dixeris: quid hoc? aut: quorsum hoc? omnia enim ad illorum usum creata sunt. Et ne dixeris: quid istud? aut quorsum istud? omnia enim in tempore suo quaerentur.”

Tob. XII. 7.

"Etenim sacramentum regis abscondere bonum est: opera autem Dei revelare et confiteri honorificum est."

Sap. X. 5.

"Haec et in consensu nequitiae justum, et conservavit sine querela Deo, et in filii misericordia fortem custodivit."

Tob. XII. 7.

(Already quoted.)

Sap. I. 4.

"— quoniam in malevolam animam non introibit sapientia, nec habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis."

Eccli. XXI. 21.

"Tamquam domus exterminata, sic fatuo sapientia: et scientia insensati inenarrabilia verba."

Sap. IX. 6.

"Nam et si quis erit consummatus inter filios hominum, si ab illo abfuerit sapientia tua, in nihilum computabitur."

Sap. VII. 26.

(Already quoted.)

Orig. Contra Celsum, Lib. V.
19.

"Quemadmodum, et apud Tobiam legitur: 'Sacramentum regis bonum est abscondere; sed opera Dei sincere revelare. . . pulchrum est.' "

Ibid. 29.

"Sic enim ibi de sapientia: 'Haec et in consensu nequitiae, cum gentes confusae fuissent, scivit justum, et conservavit sine querela Deo, et in filii misericordia fortem custodivit.' "

Ibid.

(Already quoted.)

Ibid.

"—de qua pulchre scriptum est: 'In malevolam animam non introibit sapientia, nec habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis.' "

Orig. Contra Celsum, Lib.
VI. 7.

"Modo Jesu Sirach filius, qui librum, Sapientiam (Sirach) inscriptum, conscripsit: 'Scientia stulti, sermones inextricabiles.' "

Ibid. 13.

"Nam et si quis erit consummatus inter filios hominum, si ab illo abfuerit sapientia, quae a te est, in nihilum computabitur."

Ibid. 63.

(Already quoted.)

Sap. XVII. 1.

"Magna sunt enim judicia tua Domine, et inenarrabilia verba tua: propter hoc indisciplinatae animae erraverunt."

Sap. I. 5.

"Spiritus enim sanctus disciplinae effugiet fictum, et auferet se a cogitationibus, quae sunt sine intellectu, et corripitur a superveniente iniquitate."

Eccli. XXI. 21.

(Already quoted.)

Sap. XII. 1—2.

"O quam bonus, et suavis est, Domine, spiritus tuus in omnibus! Ideoque eos, qui exerrant, partibus corripis: et de quibus peccant, admones et alloqueris: ut relicta malitia, credant in te, Domine."

Sap. VII. 25—26.

(Already quoted.)

Sap. XVII. 1.

I. Maccab. IX. 55; II. Maccab. III. 24; IX. 5.

Eccli. X. 23.

"Semen hominum honorabitur hoc, quod timet Deum: semen autem hoc exhonorabitur, quod praeterit mandata Domini."

Ibid. 79.

"Verum nihil mirandum est quoniam: 'Dei judicia magna sunt, et explicatu ardua; indisciplinatas animas,' adeoque Celsum, 'errare.'"

Contra Celsum, Lib. VIII. 8.

"Spiritus enim sanctus disciplinae effugiet fictum, et auferet se a cogitationibus quae sunt sine intellectu."

Ibid. 12.

(Already quoted.)

Ibid. 51.

"Incorruptibilis spiritus tuus est in omnibus, quapropter delinquentes paulatim arguit Deus."

Orig. Contra Celsum, Lib. VIII. 14.

(Already quoted.)

Ibid. 32.

Ibid. 46.

"—et alii qui, Judaeorum cultum violare in templo ausi fuerint, referunt Machabaeorum libri."

Ibid. 50.

"Hoc docet divina Scriptura: 'Ecquod semen in honore? semen hominis; ecquod semen in contemptu? semen hominis.'"

Eccli. X. 4.

"In manu Dei potestas terrae: et utilem rectorem suscitabit in tempus super illam."

Sap. I. 13.

"Quoniam Deus mortem non fecit, nec laetatur in perditione vivorum."

Sap. VIII. 2.

"Hanc amavi, et exquisivi a juventute mea, et quaesivi sponsam mihi eam assumere, et amator factus sum formae illius."

Sap. VIII. 2.

(Already quoted.)

Eccli. XXII. 24.

"Pungens oculum deducit lacrymas: et qui pungit cor, profert sensum."

Sap. II. 20.

"Morte turpissima condemnemus eum: erit enim ei respectus ex sermonibus illius."

Baruch III. 9.

"Audi, Israel, mandata vitae auribus percipe, ut scias prudentiam."

Eccli. VII. 40.

"In omnibus operibus tuis memorare novissima tua, et in aeternum non peccabis."

Ibid. 68.

"—quique utilem rectorem suscitavit in tempus super terram."

Orig. Selecta in Genesim.

"Deus enim mortem non fecit, nec delectatur in perditione vivorum."

Orig. Homilia VI. in Genesim.

"—sicut et ille sapiens qui dicebat de sapientia: 'Hanc quaesivi adducere mihi sponsam.'"

Homilia XI. in Genesim, 1.

"Sicut et ille qui dicebat de sapientia: 'Hanc ego cogitavi uxorem adducere mihi.'"

"Orig. in Exodum, Homilia IV. 5.

"Pro illo vero alia Scriptura dicit: 'Punge oculum, et producit lacrymam; punge cor, et producit sensum.'"

Hom. VI. in Exodum, 1.

"De quo etiam Propheta praedixerat: 'Morte turpissima condemnemus eum.'"

Hom. VII. in Exod. 2.

"Sicut et alibi (Scriptura) dicit: 'Audi, Israel, mandata vitae.'"

Hom. IX. in Exod. 4.

"Memor esto novissimorum tuorum, et non peccabis."

Dan. XIII. 22—23.

“Ingemuit Susanna, et ait: Angustiae sunt mihi undique: si enim hoc egero, mors mihi est: si autem non egero, non effugiam manus vestras. Sed melius est mihi absque opere incidere in manus vestras, quam peccare in conspectu Domini.”

Sap. I. 7.

“Quoniam spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum: et hoc, quod continet omnia, scientiam habet vocis.”

Sap. VIII. 20.

“Et cum essem magis bonus veni ad corpus incoinquinatum.”

Eccli. XXVIII. 22.

“Multi ceciderunt in ore gladii, sed non sic quasi qui interierunt per linguam suam.”

Sap. VII. 20

“— naturas animalium, et iras bestiarum, vim ventorum, et cogitationes hominum, et virtutes radicum.”

Hom. I. in Leviticum, 1.

“But it behooves us to use against the impious presbyters the words of the *blessed Susanna*, which they indeed *repudiating*, have cut off from the catalogue of divine Scripture the history of *Susanna*. But we receive it, and appositely adduce it against them, saying: ‘I am straitened on every side: for if I do this thing (follow the letter of the Law) it is death to me; and if I do it not, I shall not escape your hands. But it is better for me to fall into your hands without doing it than to sin in the sight of the Lord.’”

Hom. V. in Leviticum, 2.

“Et iterum alibi: ‘Spiritus enim Domini replevit orbem terrarum.’”

Hom. XII. in Levit. 4.

“Ipse (Jesus) enim erat qui et dudum per Salomonem dixerat: ‘Magis autem cum essem bonus, veni ad corpus incoinquinatum.’”

Orig. Hom. VIII. in Numeros, 1.

“Non legisti? ‘Dicunt quia vulnerant gladii sed non ita ut lingua?’”

Hom. XII. in Numeros, 1.

“—de quorum scientia dicebat ille qui repletus est sapientia Dei: ‘Ipse enim mihi dedit eorum quae sunt scientiam veram, ut scirem substantiam

mundi et elementorum virtutem, initium et finem et medietatem temporum, vicissitudinem, permutationes et commutationes temporum, anni circulos, et astrorum positiones, naturas animalium, et iras bestiarum, spirituum violentias et cogitationes hominum, differentias virgultorum, et virtutes radicum.' "

Sap. VII. 10.

(Already quoted.)

Sap. VII. 22—23.

"— est enim in illa spiritus intelligentiae, sanctus, unicus, multiplex, subtilis, disertus, mobilis, incoinquinatus. certus, suavis, amans bonum, acutus, quem nihil vetat, benefaciens, humanus, benignus, stabilis, certus, securus, omnem habens virtutem, omnia prospiciens, et qui capiat omnes spiritus, intelligibilis, mundus, subtilis."

Eccli. I. 1.

"Omnis sapientia a Domino Deo est, et cum illo fuit semper, et est ante aevum."

Eccli. XIX. 19

"Et non est sapientia nequitiae disciplina: et non est cogitatus peccatorum prudentia."

Ibid.

(Already quoted.)

Orig. Hom. in Numeros, XVII. 6.

"—quia et spiritus sapientiae, qui intelligibilis et sanctus et unicus et multiplex dicitur, similiter et subtilis esse perhibetur."

Hom. XVIII. in Numeros, 3.

"In libro, qui apud nos quidem inter Salomonis volumina haberi solet, et Ecclesiasticus dici, apud Graecos vero Sapientia Jesu filii Sirach appellatur, scriptum est: 'Omnis sapientia a Deo est.' "

Ibid.

"Non est enim sapientia malitiae disciplina."

Sap. III. 16.

"Fili autem adulterorum in inconsummatione erunt, et ab iniquo thoro semen exterminabitur."

Eccli. XVI. 5.

"Ab uno sensato inhabitabitur patria, tribus impiorum deseretur."

Sap. IX. 15.

"Corpus enim, quod corrumpitur, aggravat animam, et terrena inhabitatio deprimit sensum multa cogitantem."

Eccli. XIV. 23.

"Qui excogitat vias illius in corde suo, et in absconditis suis intelligens, vadens post illam quasi investigator, et in viis illius consistens—."

Eccli. II. 1.

"Fili, accedens ad servitutum Dei, sta in justitia, et timore, et præpara animam tuam ad tentationem."

Dan. XIII. 56.

"Et, amoto eo, jussit venire alium, et dixit ei: Semen Chanaan, et non Juda, species decepit te, et concupiscentia subvertit cor tuum —."

Eccli. III. 20.

"Quanto magnus es, humilia te in omnibus, et coram Deo invenies gratiam —."

Hom. in Numeros XX. 2.

"— de quibus scriptum est: 'Fili autem adulterorum imperfecti erunt, et ex iniquo concubitu semen exterminabitur.'"

Hom. XXI. in Num. 2.

"Denique et scriptum est: Per unum sapientem inhabitabitur civitas; tribus autem iniquorum desolabitur.'"

Hom. XXIII. in Num. 11.

"'Corpus enim corruptibile,' ut ait ille sapientissimus, 'aggravat animam, et deprimit sensum multa cogitantem.'"

Hom. XXVIII, in Num. 1.

"Sed et ego qui lego de sapientia scriptum: 'Exi post eam sicut investigator—.'"

Orig. Hom. XI. in Joshua, 2.

"Sed et Salomon similia dicit: 'Fili,' inquit, 'accedens ad servitutum Domini, præpara animam tuam ad tentationem.'"

Hom. XXII. in Joshua, 6.

"—Cui dicitur a Propheta, 'Semen Chanaan et non Juda, species seduxit te.'"

Hom. XXIV. in Joshua, 2.

"—quod dicitur: 'Quanto magnus es tanto magis humilia te, et ante Dominum invenies

Ibid. XXXII. 1.

"Rectorem te posuerunt? noli extolli: esto in illis quasi unus ex ipsis."

Eccli. X. 15.

"— quoniam ab eo, qui fecit illum, recessit cor ejus; quoniam initium omnis peccati est superbia—."

Eccli. XXV. 3, 4.

"Tres species odit anima mea, et aggravor valde animæ illorum: pauperem superbum: divitem mendacem: senem fatuum et insensatum."

Judith XIII.

Eccli. XXVII. 12.

"Homo sanctus in sapientia manet sicut sol: nam stultus sicut luna mutatur."

Eccli. III. 22.

"Altiora te ne quæsieris, et fortiora te ne scrutatus fueris: sed quæ præcepit tibi Deus, illa cogita semper, et in pluribus operibus ejus ne fueris curiosus."

gratiam,' et iterum quod scriptum est: 'Si te ducem ordina-verint, ne extollaris, sed esto inter eos quasi unus ex ipsis.' "

Orig. Hom. III. in Judic. 1.

"—quia sicut Scriptura dicit: 'Initium discedendi a Domino, superbia—.' "

Ibid.

"Nihil invenies tam foedum neque execrabile, sicut Scriptura dicit, quam 'pauperem superbum et divitem mendacem.' "

Hom. IX. in Judic. 1.

"Quid ego illam magnificam et omnium feminarum nobilissimam memorem, Judith, quæ jam perditis pene rebus, non dubitavit sola succurrere, seseque suumque caput immanissimi Holophernis neci sola sub-jicere, et processit ad bellum non in armis, neque in equis bellicis aut in subsidiis militari-bus freta, sed in virtute animi; et confidentia fidei, consilio simul et audacia hostem perim-it."

Orig. Hom. I. in Reg. 4.

"—quia et secundum Scripturas: 'insipiens sicut luna mutatur.' "

Hom. II. in Reg. 4.

"Nam et Salomon dicit: 'Altiora te ne quæsieris, et fortiora te ne scrutere, sed de quibus tibi præceptum est, hæc intellige.' "

Eccli. I. 11.

"Timor Domini gloria, et gloriatio, et lætitia, et corona exultationis."

Sap. V. 18—21.

"Accipiet armaturam zelus illius, et armabit creaturam ad ultionem inimicorum. Induet pro thorace justitiam, et accipiet pro galea iudicium certum; sumet scutum inexpugnabile æquitatem, acuet autem duram iram in lanceam, et pugnabit cum illo orbis terrarum contra insensatos."

Dan. XIII. 25 et seqq.

"Cumque duceretur ad mortem, suscitavit Dominus spiritum sanctum pueri junioris, cujus nomen Daniel."

Sap. V. 4.

"Nos insensati vitam illorum æstimabamus insaniam, et finem illorum sine honore."

Esther XIV. 11.

"Ne tradas, Domine, sceptrum tuum his, qui non sunt, ne rideant ad ruinam nostram: sed converte consilium eorum super eos, et eum, qui in nos coepit sævire, disperde."

Eccli. VIII. 6.

"Ne despicias hominem avertentem se a peccato, neque

Orig. Selecta in Ps. XXI. 32.

"Generatio autem Sapientiæ est secundum Salomonem: 'timor Domini, divitiæ, gloria ac vita.'"

Selecta in Ps. XXXIV. 2.

"Accipiet armaturam zelum illius, et armabit creaturam ad ultionem inimicorum. Induet pro thorace justitiam, et accipiet pro galea iudicium certum, sumet scutum inexpugnabile æquitatem, acuet autem duram iram in lanceam."

Hom. IV. in Ps. XXXVI. 2.

"Respice beatum Danielelem, qui a puero et prophetiæ gratiam meruit, et iniquos arguens presbyteros, puer coronam justitiæ et castitatis obtinuit."

Hom. V. in Ps. XXXVI. 5.

"—ita ut illi qui in poenis sunt, videntes eos in gloria dicent: Nos stulti vitam eorum putabamus insaniam."

Ibid.

"Et in libro Esther dicitur: 'Non tradas, Domine, sceptrum tuum his qui non sunt.'"

Hom. II. in Ps. XXXVII. 1.

"—nec memores Scripturæ sunt divinæ dicentis: 'Noli im-

improperes ei; memento quoniam omnes in correptione sumus."

Eccli. XXVIII. 28, 29.

"Sepi aures tuas spinis, linguam nequam noli audire, et ori tuo facito ostia, et seras. Aurum tuum et argentum tuum confla, et verbis tuis facito stateram, et frenos ori tuo rectos—."

Eccli. XXIII. 2.

"Quis superponet in cogitatu meo flagella, et in corde meo doctrinam sapientiæ, ut ignorationibus eorum non parcant mihi, et non appareant delicta eorum?"

Eccli. XXI. 29.

"In ore fatuorum cor illorum: et in corde sapientium os illorum."

Eccli. XV. 9.

"Non est speciosa laus in ore peccatoris—."

Sap. I. 4.

"—quoniam in malevolam animam non introibit sapientia, nec habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis."

properare homini convertenti se a peccato, sed memor esto quoniam omnes sumus in culpis.' "

Hom. I. in Ps. XXXVIII. 3.

"Alibi quidem scriptum est: 'Vide, circumduc sepem spinarum circa possessionem tuam.' Et iterum: 'Pecuniam tuam et aurum tuum alliga, et ori tuo facito ostium et seram, et verbis tuis, jugum et stateram.' "

Hom. II. in Ps. XXXV. III. 7.

"Sed novi ego et alia flagella quibus vehementius cruciamur, illa scilicet quæ per prophetam describit sapientia (prophetam enim eum dico): 'Quis dabit in cogitatu meo correptionem sapientiæ, ut ignorationibus meis quæ feci non parcat, et peccata mea non prætereantur?' "

Orig. Selecta in Ps. LI. Vers. 4.

"—in ore stultorum cor eorum est."

Selecta in Ps. LXV. Vers. 2.

"—quia non est speciosa laus in ore peccatoris."

Selecta in Ps. LXXXVIII. Vers. 32.

"Qui non custodit mandata Dei desivit esse thronus Dei, nam: 'In malevolam animam, non introibit sapientia, neque habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis.' "

Sap. I. 4.

(Already quoted.)

Eccli. XXVII. 12.

"Homo sanctus in sapientia manet sicut sol: nam stultus sicut luna mutatur."

Baruch III. 38.

"Post haec in terris visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

Eccli. XV. 9.

(Already quoted.)

Sap. VII. 25.

(Already quoted.)

Sap. IV. 13

"Consummatus in brevi, explevit tempora multa—."

Sap. VIII. 2.

"Hanc amavi, et exquisivi a juventute mea, et quæsi sponsam mihi eam assumere, et amator factus sum formæ illius."

Eccli. I. 33.

"Fili, concupiscens sapientiam, conserva justitiam? et Deus præbebit illam tibi."

Sap. XI. 27. 27—XII. 1.

"Parcis autem omnibus: quoniam tua sunt, Domine, qui amas animas. O quam bonus,

Selecta in Ps. CXVIII. Vers.

155.

(Already quoted.)

Selecta in Ps. CXX. Vers. 6.

"—Stultus ut luna mutatur."

Selecta in Ps. CXXV. Vers.

2.

"Post haec enim in terra visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

Selecta in CXLIX. Vers. 1.

(Already quoted.)

Orig. Fragmenta in Prov. I.

2.

(Already many times quoted.)

Ibid. Cap. XXX.

"—siquidem 'in brevi consummatus, explevit tempora multa.'"

Orig. Prologus in Canticum Cantic.

"Sed et in eo libello qui dicitur Sapientia Salomonis ita scriptum est de ipsa sapientia: 'Amator factus sum decoris ejus.'"

Ibid.

"—et intelligere illud quod scriptum est: 'Concupisti sapientiam? serva mandata, et Dominus dabit eam tibi.'"

Orig. in Cant. Cantic. Lib. III. Vers. 4.

"—quamvis verum sit ut dicitur ad eum: 'Parcis autem omnibus, quia omnia tua sunt

et suavis est, Domine, spiritus tuus in omnibus."

Sap. VII. 17—20.

(Already quoted.)

Eccli. XXVIII. 29.

"Aurum tuum et argentum tuum conflat, et verbis tuis facito stateram, et frenos ori tuo rectos—."

Eccli. IV. 33.

"Pro justitia agonizare pro anima tua, et usque ad mortem certa pro justitia, et Deus expugnabit pro te inimicos tuos."

Sap. VII. 22.

"— est enim in illa spiritus intelligentiae, sanctus, unicus, multiplex, subtilis, disertus, mobilis—."

Sap. I. 13, 14, et II. 24.

"Quoniam Deus mortem non fecit, nec laetatur in perditione vivorum. Creavit enim, ut essent omnia: et sanabiles fecit nationes orbis terrarum: et non est in illis medicamentum exterminii, nec inferorum regnum in terra. Invidia autem diaboli mors introivit in orbem terrarum—."

Eccli. XXI. 18.

"Verbum sapiens quodcumque audierit sciens laudabit, et ad se adjiciet—."

Eccli. XXVIII. 2.

(Already quoted.)

Domine, amator animarum. Spiritus enim incorruptionis est in omnibus.' "

Ibid. Vers. 9.

(Already quoted.)

Ibid. Cap. VII. Vers. 8.

"—juxta illud: 'Ori tuo fac ostium, et vectem, et verbis tuis fac modum et stateram.' "

Ibid. Cap. VIII. 6.

"Et usque ad mortem certa pro justitia."

Hom. VI. in Isaiam, 5.

"Dicitur enim de S. Spiritu, qui est secundum sapientiam, quia sit multifarius, tenuis, mobilis."

Hom. II. in Jeremiam I.

"'Deus mortem non fecit, neque delectatur in perditione viventium. Creavit enim ut essent omnia, et salutare generationes mundi, nec est in eis venenum mortis, neque inferni regnum super terram.' Deinde paululum ultra procedens invenio unde sit mors: 'Invidia autem diaboli, mors intravit in orbem terrarum.' "

Hom. VI. in Jerem. 1.

"Quoniam vero: 'Verbum sapiens si audierit sciens, laudabit, et ad illud adjiciet.' "

Ibid. 2.

(Already quoted.)

Baruch III. 9—13.

“Audi, Israel, mandata vitæ: auribus percipe, ut scias prudentiam. Quid est, Israel, quod in terra inimicorum es? inveterasti in terra aliena, coinquinatus es cum mortuis; deputatus es cum descendantibus in infernum. Dereliquisti fontem sapientiæ; nam si in via Dei ambulasses, habitasses utique in pace sempiterna.”

Sap. III. 11.

“Sapientiam enim, et disciplinam qui abjicit, infelix est: et vacua est spes illorum, et labores sine fructu, et inutilia opera eorum.”

Eccli. XXXI. 10.

“Qui probatus est in illo et perfectus est, erit illi gloria æterna: qui potuit transgredi, et non est transgressus: facere mala, et non fecit—.”

Baruch III. 10, 11.

“Quid est, Israel, quod in terra inimicorum es? inveterasti in terra aliena, coinquinatus es cum mortuis: deputatus es cum descendantibus in infernum.”

Sap. III. 1.

“Justorum autem animæ in manu Dei sunt, et non tanget illos tormentum mortis.”

Hom. VII. in Jerem. 3.

“—et abire in terram de qua scriptum est: ‘Audi, Israel, quid est quod in terra inimicorum es? Computatus es cum descendantibus in infernum; dereliquisti fontem vitæ, Dominum: in via Dei si ambulasses, habitasses utique in pace in sæculum.’ ”

Hom. VIII. in Jerem. 1.

“‘Sapientiam autem et disciplinam qui abjicit, infelix est, et vana spes ejus, et labores ejus insensati, et inutilia opera ejus,’ ait Sapientia, quæ dicitur Salomonis.”

Selecta in Jerem. Cap. II. 32.

“Gloria enim æterna super caput justorum.”

Ibid. Cap. XXXI. 16.

“Scriptum est in Baruch: ‘Quid est quod in terra inimicorum es, et coinquinatus es cum mortuis?’ ”

Ibid. Cap. XLV. 5.

“—Nam ‘justorum animæ in manu Dei sunt.’ ”

Eccli. I. 2.

"Arenam maris, et pluviae guttas, et dies sæculi quis dinumeravit? Altitudinem cœli, et latitudinem terræ, et profundum abyssi quis dimensus est?"

Eccli. VII. 6.

"Noli quærere fieri iudex, nisi valeas virtute irrumperere iniquitates: ne forte extimescas faciem potentis, et ponas scandalum in æquitate tua."

Dan. XIII. 56.

"Et, amoto eo, jussit venire alium, et dixit ei: Semen Chanaan, et non Juda, species decepit te, et concupiscentia subvertit cor tuum—."

Eccli. X. 9, 10.

"Avaro autem nihil est scelestius. Quid superbit terra et cinis? Nihil est iniquius quam amare pecuniam; hic enim et animam suam venalem habet: quoniam in vita sua projecit intimam suam."

Eccli. III. 20.

"Quanto magnus es, humilia te in omnibus, et coram Deo invenies gratiam.—"

Sap. VI. 7.

"Exiguo enim conceditur misericordia: potentes autem potenter tormenta patientur."

Orig. Hom. IV. in Ezechiel, 2.

"Arenam maris et pluviae stillas et dies sæculi, quis dinumerabit? Altitudinem cœli et latitudinem terræ et profundum Sapientiæ, quis investigabit?"

Hom. V. in Ezech. 4.

"—et ante oculos mihi proponens illum iudicii ordinem qui in Scripturis continetur, recordor dicti illius: 'Pondus ultra te ne leves.' Sed et illud: 'Noli quærere fieri iudex, ne non valeas auferre iniquitates.'"

Hom. VI. in Ezech. 3.

"Sæpe miratus sum id quod dictum est a Daniel ad presbyterum peccatorem, cui pro peccato nomen imponens: 'Semen,' inquit 'Chanaan et non Juda.'"

Hom. IX. in Ezech. 2.

"Quid enim ait Scriptura? 'Quid superbit terra et cinis?' et: 'In vita ejus projecit interanea ejus.'"

Ibid.

"—dicente Scriptura: 'Quanto magnus fuerit, tanto humilia te ipsum.'"

Hom. X. in Ezech. 2.

"Justum est quippe iudicium Dei, et 'potentes potenter tormenta patiuntur.'"

- Eccli. XVIII. 30.
 "Post concupiscentias tuas non eas, et a voluntate tua avertere."
- Eccli. XXVII. 12.
 "Homo sanctus in sapientia manet sicut sol: nam stultus sicut luna mutatur."
- Esther XIV. 2.
 "Cumque deposuisset vestes regias, fletibus et luctui apta indumenta suscepit—."
- Sap. VII. 26.
 (Already quoted).
- Eccli. XXVII. 28.
 "Qui in altum mittit lapidem, super caput ejus cadet: et plaga dolosa dolosi dividet vulnera."
- Sap. II. 21, 22.
 "Hæc cogitaverunt, et erraverunt: excæcavit enim illos malitia eorum. Et nescierunt sacramenta Dei—."
- Sap. VIII. 1.
 "Attingit ergo a fine usque ad finem fortiter, et disponit omnia suaviter."
- Eccli. IV. 33.
 "Pro justitia agonizare pro anima tua, et usque ad mortem certa pro justitia, et Deus expugnabit pro te inimicos tuos."
- Orig. Comment. in Math. Tom. XII. 22.
 "Post concupiscentias tuas non eas."
- Ibid. Tom. XIII. 4.
 "Nobis . . . proderit is qui in Sapientia de justis quidem æquabilitate et constantia ait: 'Narratio pii semper est sapientia . . . stultus autem sicut luna mutatur.'"
- Ibid. 20.
 "Simile in libro Esther dictum esse de illo, inquires, cum scriptum est: 'Cum deposuisset omnem ornatum suum.'"
- Ibid. Tom. XV. 10.
 (Already quoted).
- Ibid. Tom. XVI. 3.
 "Nam 'qui in altum mittit lapidem, in caput suum mittit.'"
- Ibid.
 "—quoniam 'excæcavit illos malitia eorum, et nescierunt sacramenta Dei.'"
- Ibid.
 "—cum, 'attingit a fine terræ usque ad finem fortiter, et disponit' ecclesias 'suaviter.'"
- Ibid. Tom. XVII. 25.
 "—illudque dogma observantes: 'Usque ad mortem certa pro veritate, et Deus pugnabit pro te.'"
- (21) H. S.

Sap. VIII. 2.

"Hanc amavi, et exquisivi a juventute mea, et quæsivi sponsam mihi eam assumere, et amator factus sum formæ illius."

Eccli. III. 20.

"Quanto magnus es, humilia te in omnibus, et coram Deo invenies gratiam—."

Eccli. XXI. 2.

"Quasi a facie colubri fuge peccata: et si accesseris ad illa, suscipient te."

Eccli. IX. 4.

"Cum saltatrice ne assiduus sis: nec audias illam, ne forte pereas in efficacia illius."

Eccli. XXI. 2.

(Already quoted.)

Dan. XIII. 55.

"Dixit autem Daniel; Recte mentitus es in caput tuum: Ecce enim Angelus Dei, accepta sententia ab eo, scindet te medium."

Sap. IX. 6.

"Nam et si quis erit consummatus inter filios hominum, si ab illo abfuerit sapientia tua, in nihilum computabitur."

Sap. VII. 17-20.

(Already quoted.)

Ibid. 32.

"Mulier quidem dicta est Sapientia propter illud: 'Quæsivi sponsam mihi eam assumere.'"

Orig. in Math. Comment. Series, 12.

"—cum deberent recordari Sapientiæ verbum dicentis: 'Quantum magnus es, tantum humilia te, et coram Deo invenies gratiam.' " (Oft quoted.)

Ibid. 42.

"— et quod ait Sapientia: 'Quasi a facie serpentis, fuge peccatum.' "

Ibid. 44.

"Cum saltatrice noli assiduus esse, ne forte consumaris in desideriiis ejus."

Ibid.

"Ideo bene dixit Scriptura: 'Quasi a facie serpentis, fuge peccatum.' "

Ibid. 61.

"—quoniam Angelus Deus; habens gladium, scindet te medium."

Ibid. 69.

"—quod ait Salomon: 'Et si fuerit quis perfectus inter filios hominum, si abfuerit ab illo Sapientia tua in nihilum reputabitur.' "

Orig. Hom. XXI. in Lucam.

(Already quoted.)

II. Maccab. VII. 28.

"Peto, nate, ut aspicias ad cœlum et terram, et ad omnia quæ in eis sunt: et intelligas, quia ex nihilo fecit illa Deus, et hominum genus."

Esther XIV. 11.

(Already quoted.)

Judith, IX. 2.

"Domine Deus patris mei Simeon, qui dedisti illi gladium in defensionem alienigenarum—."

Baruch III. 38.

(Already quoted.)

Eccli. XVIII. 6.

"Cum consummaverit homo, tunc incipiet: et cum quieverit, aporiabitur."

Sap. XVII. 1.

"Magna sunt enim judicia tua, Domine, et inenarrabilia verba tua: propter hoc indisciplinata animæ erraverunt."

Sap. VII. 26.

(Oft quoted.)

I. Maccab. I. 22, 23.

"—et ascendit Jerosolymam in multitudine gravi. Et intra-
vit in sanctificationem cum superbia, et accepit altare aureum et candelabrum luminis, et universa vasa ejus, et mensam propositionis, et libatoria, et phialas, et mortariola aurea,

Orig. Comment. in Joannem,
Tom. I. 18.

"Secus vero apud nos est, qui credimus ex non entibus Deum entia fecisse, ut mater illa septem Martyrum in Machabæorum gestis, et pœnitentiæ angelus in 'Pastore' docuit."

Ibid. Tom. II. 7.

(Already quoted.)

Ibid. 16.

"Verum Eliæ profecto etiam est Deus, et, ut inquit Judith, patris sui Symeon."

Ibid. Tom. VI. 15.

(Already quoted.)

Ibid. 19.

"Quoniam cum absolverit homo, tunc incipit; et quum quieverit, tunc incertus erit,' juxta Jesu filii Sirach Sapientiam."

Ibid. 36.

"Magna enim judicia Dei,' eaque aegre nec facile narrantur, atque 'ob hanc causam rudes animæ erraverunt.' "

Ibid. 37.

(Oft quoted.)

Ibid, Tom. X. 22.

"Apparet etiam apud Machabaica, multam inconstantiam et confusionem fuisse, circa templum et circa populum—."

et velum, et coronas, et ornamentum aureum, quod in facie templi erat: et comminuit omnia."

Eccli. III. 22.

"Altiora te ne quæsieris, et fortiora te ne scrutatus fueris.—"

Sap. 25, 26.

(Oft quoted.)

Eccli. XXI. 18.

"Verbum sapiens quodcumque audierit sciens laudabit, et ad se adjiciet—."

II. Maccab. XV. 14.

"Respondentem vero Oniam dixisse: Hic est fratrum amator, et populi Israel: hic est, qui multum orat pro populo, et universa sancta civitate Jeremias, propheta Dei."

Dan. XIII. 42.

"Exclamavit autem voce magna Susanna, et dixit: Deus æterne, qui absconditorum es cognitor, qui nosti omnia antequam fiant—."

Sap. VII. 9.

"—nec comparavi illi lapidam pretiosum; quoniam omne aurum in comparatione illius, arena est exigua, et tamquam lutum æstimabitur argentum in conspectu illius."

Sap. X. 3, 4.

"Ab hac ut recessit injustus in ira sua, per iram homicidii fraterni deperit. Propter quem

Ibid. Tom. XIII. 5.

"Te difficiliora ne quæras, et te fortiora ne vestiga."

Ibid. 27.

(Oft quoted.)

Ibid. 46.

"—quoniam autem 'si sermonem sapientem audierit sapiens, laudabit eum, et ad ipsum addet—.' "

Ibid. 57.

"—quemadmodum in Machabæorum gestis scriptum est, post plurimos annos ab obitu Jeremiæ: 'Hic est Jeremias, Dei Propheta, qui multum orat pro populo.' "

Ibid. 58.

"Quomodo etiam servat illud: 'Qui videt omnia ante ortum ipsorum.' "

Ibid. Tom. XIX. 2.

"Sapientia siquidem erat quivis ejus sermo, de qua dicitur: 'Omne aurum coram sapientia est pauca arena; et ceu cœnum reputabitur argentum coram ea.' "

Ibid. Tom. XX. 4.

"Sapientiæ liber, Salomoni inscriptus, his verbis docet: 'Recedens autem ab ipsa, in-

cum aqua deleteret terram, sanavit iterum sapientia, per contemptibile lignum justum gubernans."

Sap. X. 7.

"—quibus in testimonium nequitiae fumigabunda constat deserta terra, et incerto tempore fructus habentes arbores, et incredibilis animæ memoria stans figmentum salis."

Dan. XIII. 56.

(Oft quoted.)

Sap. XII. 11.

"Semen enim erat maledictum ab initio: nec timens aliquem, veniam dabas peccatis illorum."

Sap. II. 24.

"Invidia autem diaboli, mors introivit in orbem terrarum."

Sap. VIII. 2.

"Hanc amavi, et exquisivi a juventute mea, et quæsi sponsam mihi eam assumere, et amator factus sum formæ illius."

Eccli. V. 8.

"Non tardes converti ad Dominum, et ne differas de die in diem."

Dan. XIII. 9 et 35.

"—et everterunt sensum suum, et declinaverunt oculos suos ut non viderent cælum, neque recordarentur judiciorum justorum.

justus in ira sua periit cum animis fratricidis, per quem inundatam terram rursus servavit Sapientia, vili ligno justum gubernans.' . . . '—quorum etiamnum malitiæ testimonio fumosum restat solum, et plantæ intempestivum fructum ferentes.' "

Ibid. 5.

(Oft quoted.)

Ibid.

"—dicente Sapientia: 'Semen execratione devotum ab initio.' "

Ibid. 21.

"Sic 'Invidia mors introivit in mundum.' "

Ibid. 33.

"—qui dicit: 'Amator factus sum pulchritudinis illius.' "

Ibid. Tom. XXVIII. 3.

"Quocirca memores simus necesse est illius dicti; 'Ne percuteris reverti ad Dominum neque differas de die in diem.' "

Ibid.

" 'Et averterunt mentem suam, et declinarunt oculos suos, ne in cælum suspicerent, neque memores essent judiciorum justorum.' Adducemus

Quæ flens suspexit ad cælum: erat enim cor ejus fiduciam habens in Domino."

Sap. I. 5.

"Spiritus enim sanctus disciplinæ effugiet fictum, et auferet se a cogitationibus, quæ sunt sine intellectu, et corripitur a superveniente iniquitate."

Sap. II. 24.

(Oft quoted.)

Eccli. XXXI. 17.

"Ne comprimar in convivio."

Dan. XIII. 42.

(Already quoted.)

Sap. VII. 25, 26.

(Oft quoted.)

Eccli. XV. 17, 18.

"Apposuit tibi aquam et ignem: ad quod volueris, porrige manum tuam. Ante hominem vita et mors, bonum et malum: quod placuerit ei, dabitur illi—."

Sap. XI. 21.

"—sed omnia in mensura, et numero, et pondere, disposuisti."

etiam in medium quæ de Sussanna scribuntur hoc modo dicta: 'At illa flens suspexit in cælum, quoniam cor ejus fidebat Domino.' "

Ibid. 13.

"Spiritus sanctus disciplinæ effugiet dolosum, et recedet a pravis consiliis."

Ibid. Tom. XXXII. 3.

(Oft quoted.)

Ibid. 14.

"Scriptum est enim et hoc quoque: 'Ne comprimar cum eo in catino.' "

Orig. Comment. in Epist. ad

Rom. Lib. I. 3.

(Already quoted.)

Ibid. 5.

(Oft quoted.)

Ibid. 18.

"—sicut scriptum est: 'Ecce posui ante faciem tuam vitam et mortem, ignem et aquam.' "

Ibid. Lib. II. 3.

"Sed sicut omnia in mensura facit Deus, et pondere et numero—."

Tob. XII. 7.

"Etenim sacramentum regis abscondere bonum est: opera autem Dei revelare et confiteri honorificum est."

Baruch IV. 4.

"Beati sumus, Israel: quia quæ Deo placent, manifesta sunt nobis."

Eccli. XXVIII. 28.

"Sepi aures tuas spinis, linguam nequam noli audire, et ori tuo facito ostia, et seras."

Eccli. XI. 30.

"Ante mortem ne laudes hominem quemquam, quoniam in filiis suis agnoscitur vir."

Sap. IX. 15.

"Corpus enim, quod corrumpitur, aggravat animam, et terrena inhabitatio deprimit sensum multa cogitantem."

Sap. I. 1.

"Diligite justitiam, qui iudicatis terram."

Tob. IV. 16.

"Quod ab alio oderis fieri tibi, vide ne tu aliquando alteri facias."

Ibid. 4.

"'Mysterium' vero 'regis abscondere bonum est.'"

Ibid. 7.

"—et ipsi dicunt: 'Beati sumus, Israel, quia quæ placent Deo nobis nota sunt.'"

Ibid. 13.

"—et dicit *circumcidi aures*, cum secundum Salomonis monita non recipiunt vanam auditionem, et cum oppilantur, ne audiant iudicium sanguinis, et cum *sepiuntur spinis* ne recipiant obtrectionem."

Ibid. Lib. III. 2.

"—sicut et *Scriptura dicit*: 'Ne beatificaveris hominem ante mortem, quia nescis quæ erunt ejus novissima.'"

Ibid.

"—nunc vero, *ut ait Scriptura*, 'Corruptibile corpus aggravat animam, et demergit terrena habitatio sensum multa cogitantem.'"

Ibid. 7.

"—et ideo (Sapientia) ait: 'Discite justitiam, qui iudicatis terram.'"

Ibid.

"Illa enim lex potest sentire quod inter homines justum sit, ut quod in se quis pati non vult, hoc ne proximo faciat."

Eccli. XV. 9.

"Non est speciosa laus in ore peccatoris—."

Sap. VII. 26.

(Oft quoted)

II. Maccab. VII. 1, et seqq.

"Contigit autem et septem fratres una cum matre sua apprehensos compelli a rege edere contra fas carnes porcinas, flarris, et taureis cruciatis."

Baruch III. 36-38.

(Oft quoted.)

Sap. X. 1.

"Hæc illum, qui primus formatus est a Deo pater orbis terrarum, cum solus esset creatus, custodivit."

Sap. IX. 6.

"Nam et si quis erit consummatus inter filios hominum, si ab illo abfuerit sapientia tua, in nihilum computabitur."

Sap. IX. 15.

(Oft quoted)

Dan. III. 86. Deut. Frag.

"Benedicite, spiritus et animæ justorum, Domino: laudate et superexaltate eum in sæcula."

Eccli. I. 16.

"Initium sapientiæ, timor Domini—."

Ibid.

"Et iterum *alia Scriptura dicit*: 'Non est speciosa laus Dei in ore peccatoris.' "

Ibid. Lib. IV. 8.

(Oft quoted.)

Ibid. 10.

"Legant Machabæorum libros, ubi cum omni instantia mater cum septem filiis martyrium suscipit, quique non solum martyrium patienter excipiunt, verum et contumelias ingerunt in tyrannum—."

Ibid.

(Oft quoted.)

Ibid. Lib. V. 2.

"—sicut de Sapientia dicitur: 'Hæc,' inquit, 'illum qui primus factus est patrem mundi, cum solus esset creatus, custodivit, et liberavit eum de peccato suo.' "

Ibid. 3.

"—quia et si perfectus sit quis in filiis hominum, si non adsit ei justitia a Deo, in nihilum reputabitur."

Ibid. Lib. VI. 3.

(Oft quoted.)

Ibid. Lib. VII. 1.

"Et Daniel nihilominus testatur et dicit: 'Benedicite, spiritus et animæ justorum, Dominum.' "

Ibid.

"—quia 'initium sapientiæ timor Domini.' "

- | | |
|---|--|
| Sap. IX. 15.
(Oft quoted.) | Ibid. 4.
(Oft quoted.) |
| Eccli. VII. 40.
"In omnibus operibus tuis
memorare novissima tua, et in
æternum non peccabis." | Ibid. 10.
"Mementote novissimorum
tuorum, et in æternum non
peccabis." |
| Sap. VII. 25.
(Oft quoted.) | Ibid. 13.
(Oft quoted.) |
| Sap. I. 7.
(Oft quoted.) | Ibid.
(Oft quoted.) |
| Eccli. XXVII. 6.
"Vas figuli probat fornax; et
homines justos, tentatio tribu-
lationis." | Ibid. 17.
"Et Sapientia dicit: 'vasa
figuli probat fornax; et hom-
ines justos, tentatio.'" |
| Sap. VII. 26.
(Oft quoted.) | Ibid. Lib. VIII. 4.
(Oft quoted.) |
| Sap. I. 2.
"—quoniam invenitur ab his
qui non tentant illum; apparet
autem eis, qui fidem habent in
illum—." | Ibid. 5.
"Sed audi quid etiam in Sa-
pientia Salomonis dicatur quia:
'non invenietur ab his qui ten-
tant eam: apparebit vero his
qui non sunt increduli ad
eum.'" |
| Tob. XII. 7.
(Oft quoted.) | Ibid. 11.
"'Mysterium enim regis,' ait
Scriptura, 'celare bonum est.'" |
| Sap. IX. 6.
(Oft quoted.) | Ibid. Lib. IX. 3.
(Oft quoted.) |
| Eccli. VIII. 6.
"Ne despicias hominem
avertentem se a peccato, neque
improperes ei; memento quon-
iam omnes in correptione su-
mus." | Ibid. Lib. X. 31.
"—didicerat enim a <i>Scriptura non impropere homini
convertenti se a peccato.</i> " |

From these numerous quotations, taken from the fragments which remain of Origen's vast writings, we may infer what was his use of the deuterocanonical books. His authority is especially valuable, because he was conversant with Hebrew, and had examined the canon of the Jews upon their own grounds. He defends the deuterocanonical books against the attack of Africanus and the Jews; he establishes the authority of the Church as criterion of the Canon; in his use of Scripture he makes no discrimination between the books of the first and second canons, and unreservedly asserts that the deuterocanonical works are *divine Scripture*. Hence we claim the authority of Origen in support of the Catholic Canon of Scripture.

In the acts of the disputation of St. Archelaus with Manes, we find a quotation from Wisdom.*

This quotation is of much worth, since it manifests that in that early day the canon of the Syrian Church comprised the deuterocanonical works. The quotation is found in the twenty-ninth chapter of the disputation:

Sap. I. 13. "— quoniam Deus mortem non fecit, nec lætatur in perditione vivorum."	"Archelaus dixit: Nequaquam: absit! 'Deus enim mortem non fecit, nec lætatur in perditione vivorum.' "
--	--

We shall here subjoin some quotations found in the extant works of St. Methodius, surnamed Eubulius, Bishop of Tyre, the bitter adversary of Origen.†

*St. Archelaus was a bishop of Mesopotamia, renowned for piety and wisdom. The date of the disputation with Manes is the year 277 A. D. It is uncertain who has committed the disputation to writing.

†The Roman martyrology honors St. Methodius on the eighteenth of September. He was of Olympius, in Lycia, and afterwards bishop of Tyre. He suffered martyrdom in Chalcis in Greece; according to some, under Diocletian; according to others, under Decius and Valerius. De Feller inclines to the first opinion, and places the date of such event about the year 311. His doctrine, though at times inaccurate, has been much praised by Jerome, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa and others. His most celebrated work is the "Symposium of Virgins," in which he extols the virtue of chastity.

Eccli. XVIII, 30, et XIX. 2.

"Post concupiscentias tuas non eas, et a voluntate tua avertere. Vinum et mulieres apostatare faciunt sapientes, et arguent sensatos—."

"Post concupiscentias tuas ne eas, et ab appetitibus tuis prohibe te. Vinum enim et mulieres apostatare faciunt sapientes."

Sap. IV. 3.

"Multigena autem impiorum multitudo non erit utilis, et spuria vitulamina non dabunt radices altas—."

Ibid.

"— de quo et alibi: 'Multigena impiorum multitudo non erit utilis, et spuria vitulamina non dabunt radices altas.'"

Eccli. XXIII. 1, et 5, 6.

"Domine, pater et dominator vitæ meæ, ne derelinquas me in consilio eorum nec sinas me cadere in illis. Extollentiam oculorum meorum ne dederis mihi, et omne desiderium averte a me. Aufer a me ventris concupiscentias, et concubitus concupiscentiæ, ne apprehendant me—."

Ibid.

' 'Domine,' dicens 'Pater et Deus vitæ meæ, ne derelinquas me in cogitatu illorum. Extollentiam oculorum ~~amove~~ a me. Cordis concupiscentia et concubitus ne apprehendant me.' "

Sap. IV. 1, 2.

"O, quam pulchra est casta generatio cum claritate! immortalis est enim memoria illius, quoniam et apud Deum nota est, et apud homines. Cum præsens est, imitantur illam, et desiderant eam, cum se eduxerit, et in perpetuum coronata triumphat incoinquinatorum certaminum præmium vincens."

Ibid.

"In libro vero Sapientiæ palam jam, et sine ambagibus auditores ad continentiam, et castitatem attrahens *Spiritus sanctus talia modulatur* . . . clamans: 'Immortalis enim est in memoria illius: quoniam et apud Deum nota est et apud homines. Cum præsens est honorant illam et desiderant eam, cum se abduxerit, et in perpetuum coronata triumphat incoinquinatorum certaminum agone superato.' "

Sap. III. 16.

"Fili autem adulterorum in inconsummatione erunt, et ab iniquo thoro semen exterminabitur."

In the second discourse, that of Theophila:

"Et ne confugas velut in arcem securam, prolato testimonio Scripturæ dicentis: 'Fili adulterorum in inconsummatione erunt.'"

These two writers, though antagonistic in doctrine, both aid in building up our thesis, since both recognize the accepted divine Scripture of the third century. In the first discourse, that of Marcella, in the symposium, we find the following:

Sap. IV. 6.

"Ex iniquis enim somnis filii, qui nascuntur, testes sunt nequitiae adversus parentes in interrogatione sua."

Ibid.

"'Ex iniquis enim,' inquit, 'somnis, filii qui nascuntur, testes sunt nequitiae adversus parentes in interrogatione persuasibilium sermonum.'"

Sap. XV. 10, 11.

"Cinis est enim cor ejus, et terra supervacua spes illius, et luto vilior vita ejus, quoniam ignoravit, qui se finxit, et qui inspiravit illi animam quæ operatur, et qui insufflavit ei spiritum vitalem."

Ibid.

"— in libro Sapientiae ait: 'Cinis est cor eorum, et terra supervacua spes illorum, et luto vilior vita eorum, quoniam ignorarunt qui se finxit, et qui inspiravit illis animam quæ operatur, et qui insufflavit eis spiritum vitalem.'"

In the eighth discourse, that of Thecla:

Baruch III. 14.

"Disce, ubi sit prudentia, ubi sit virtus, ubi sit intellectus, ut scias simul, ubi sit longiturnitas vitæ et victus, ubi sit lumen oculorum et pax."

"Discite ubi sit prudentia, ubi sit virtus, ubi sit intellectus ut scias simul ubi sit longiturnitas vitæ et victus, ubi sit lumen oculorum et pax. Quis invenit locum ejus? et quis intravit in thesauros eorum?"

In the eleventh discourse, that of Arete:

Sap. VII. 9.

"— nec comparavi illi lapidem pretiosum, quoniam omne

"Neque si quis pecuniarum cupiditate capitur, virginita-

aurum in comparatione illius arena est exigua, et tamquam lutum æstimabitur argentum in conspectu illius."

tem vere studet colere: spernit enim illam, verius lucrum exiguum ipsi præferens; cui tamen nulla est comparabilis rerum in vita pretiosarum."

Judith XIII. Passim.

Ibid.

"Peregrinum ductorem numerosissimorum exercituum fortiter aggrediens, ardua feliciter exequens destinata, Judith dolose decollavit pulchritudinis suæ delinitum specie priusquam ullam membris corporis obtulisset maculam—."

Dan. XIII. 19, 20.

Ibid.

"Cum autem egressæ essent puellæ, surrexerunt duo senes, et accurrerunt ad eam, et dixerunt: Ecce ostia pomarii clausa sunt, et nemo nos videt, et nos in concupiscentia tui sumus; quam ob rem assentire nobis, et commiscere nobiscum."

"Videntes speciem decoram nudi Susannæ corporis, duo iudices amore furentes dixerunt: 'O mulier, hic adsumus te clam potiri cupientes.' "

Sap. I. 14.

St. Method. De Resurrectione (Fragmentary).

"Creavit enim, ut essent omnia, et sanabiles fecit nationes orbis terrarum: et non est in illis medicamentum exterminii, nec inferorum regnum in terra."

"—sapientia adstruit his verbis: 'Creavit enim Deus ut essent omnia, et salutares sunt mundi generationes, et non est in illis medicamentum exterminii.' "

Sap. II. 23.

Ibid.

"Quoniam Deus creavit hominem inexterminabilem, et ad imaginem similitudinis suæ fecit illum."

"Atqui homo est immortalis: 'Creavit enim,' inquit Sapientia, 'hominem inexterminabilem, et imaginem æternitatis suæ fecit illum.' "

Sap. VII. 21.

"—et quaecumque sunt absconsa et improvisa, didici: omnium enim artifex docuit me sapientia."

Ibid. in fine.

"Quamobrem etiam Salomon 'artificem omnium' appellavit—."

Eccli. XV. 18.

"Ante hominem vita et mors, bonum et malum; quod placuerit ei, dabitur illi—."

Ibid. ex fragmentis.

"Posui enim," inquit, 'ante faciem tuam vitam et mortem.' "

Eccli. I. 2.

"Arenam maris, et pluviae guttas, et dies sæculi quis dinumeravit?"

St. Method. De Creatis. (fragmentary).

"— quomodo Sapientia in Jesu Sirach dicit: 'Arenam maris, et pluviae guttas, et dies sæculi quis dinumerabit?' "

Sap. XV. 3.

"Nosse enim te, consummata justitia est; et scire justitiam et virtutem tuam, radix est immortalitatis."

S. Method. De Simeone et Anna.

"Porro: 'Nosse te consummata justitia est, et scire potentiam tuam radix immortalitatis.' "

Baruch III. 24.

"O Israel, quam magna est domus Dei, et ingens locus possessionis ejus!"

Ibid.

"— ut quodam loco inclytus Propheta ait: 'Quam magna domus Dei, et ingens locus possessionis ejus! Magnus, et non habet finem.' "

Eccli. XVI. 7.

"In synagoga peccantium exardebit ignis, et in gente incredibili exardescet ira."

Ibid.

"Item alio loco: 'In gente incredibili exardescit ignis.' "

Dan. XIII. 56.

"Et, amoto eo, jussit venire alium, et dixit ei: Semen Chanaan et non Juda, species

S. Methodius, in Ramos Palmarum.

"O Chanaan impudentis semen, non pii ac timentis Deum, Juda!"

decepit te, et concupiscentia
subvertit cor tuum—."

Sap. XII. 1.

"O quam bonus et suavis est,
Domine, spiritus tuus in omni-
bus!"

Method. quoted by Olym-
piodorus in Catena Nice-
tæ.

"Methodius autem, Spiritum
divinum qui a Deo omnibus
concessus est, et de quo Salo-
mon dixit: 'Incorruptus tuus
Spiritus in omnibus,' pro con-
scientia accipit, quæ et ani-
mam peccatricem condemnet."

There are several quotations from deuterocanonical Scripture in the works of St. Gregory of Neocæsarea, which we omit here, since they are found in works which Migne judged dubious.

There are a few certain citations from the deuterocanonical books in the fragments which have been collected of the works of Dionysius the Great.*

*The precise date of the birth of Dionysius the Great is uncertain. He was in Egypt when Cyprian was in North Africa, and he came under the influence of Origen. He succeeded Heraclas in the Episcopal See of Alexandria in 247 A. D., which see he held for seventeen years, till his death in 265. He was forced to flee in the Decian persecution, and, at one time, his life was only saved by a miracle. Under Valerian, he made a public profession of faith, and was exiled to Cephro in Libya. Having strenuously opposed the Sabellian Heresy, he was denounced to Dionysius, the Roman Pontiff, that his tenets were not sound concerning the substantiality of the Son and the Father. As Sabellius had denied that there was any distinction between the Father and the Son, Dionysius, in opposition, may have exceeded bounds somewhat in extending the distinction between these two persons, but his error was not formal. Dionysius cleared himself of imputation of heresy, publishing four books in his own defense. There came a lull in the persecution under Gallienus, and in 261 Dionysius returned to his see. He was called to Antioch to give judgment in the trial of the heretic Paul of Samosata, but feebleness prevented a personal appearance there. He signified his opinions in writings, fragments of which remain. Dionysius wrote many things, but only small fragments of these remain. The most important of his works are his Apology and his Letters.

The few quotations which we shall adduce will place Dionysius in the rank of those who considered the deuterocanonical books as divine Scripture.

Eccli. XVI. 26, 27.

"In iudicio Dei opera ejus ab initio, et ab institutione ipsorum distinxit partes illorum, et initia eorum in gentibus suis. Ornavit in æternum opera illorum, nec esurierunt, nec laboraverunt, et non destiterunt ab operibus suis."

Eccli. XVI. 30, 31.

"Post hæc Deus in terram respexit, et implevit illam bonis suis. Anima omnis vitalis denuntiavit ante faciem ipsius, et in ipsam iterum reversio illorum."

Tob. XII. 7.

"Etenim sacramentum regis abscondere bonum est: opera autem Dei revelare et confiteri, honorificum est."

Dionysius, De Natura III. B.

"Audite vero divinorum oraculorum vocem: 'In iudicio Domini opera ejus. Ab initio et a creatione ipsorum distinxit partes illorum. Ornavit in æternum opera sua, et principia eorum in generationes eorum.'"

Ibid. V. A.

"—et illud: 'post hæc enim Dominus in terram respexit, et implevit illam bonis suis. Anima omnis animantis operuit faciem ejus.'"

Idem. Epist. X. (Adversus Germanum) IV.

"Sed quoniam arcanum quidem regis occultare, *ut ait Scriptura*, laudandum est; Dei autem opera prædicare, gloriosum; adversus Germani impetum cominus decertabo."

The Constitutiones Apostolicæ also manifest that the Church, in the third century, recognized the deuterocanonical books as divine Scripture.*

*The age and author of the Apostolical Constitutions are uncertain. They are inserted by Migne among the Opera dubia of St. Clement of Rome; but no one now attributes to him their authorship. De Magistris contends that their author was St. Hippolyte, although he admits later interpolations. It is quite generally admitted now that the work is a product of the third century which has suffered later interpolations. The work consisted of eight books, *ὀκτάβιβλον*, containing practical precepts of Christian life, and principles of church polity. Though of uncertain authorship, and often erroneous in its present state in dogma, it is valuable to illustrate the traditions of the Church in that early age. Opinions differ as to the date of its origin, but all agree that it goes back to the third century. The name does not indicate that its author wished to deceive by making it appear that his book was written by the Apostles. The Constitutions were called Apostolic, because they were founded on the applied teachings of the Apostles.

Eccli. XXVIII. 16.

"Lingua tertia multos commovit, et dispersit illos de gente in gentem—."

Dan. XIII.

Dan. XIII. 48, 49.

"Qui cum staret in medio eorum ait: Sic fatui filii Israel, non judicantes, neque quod verum est cognoscentes, condemnastis filiam Israel? Revertimini ad iudicium, quia falsum testimonium locuti sunt adversus eam."

Judith XII. 8.

"Et ut ascendebat, orabat Dominum Deum Israel, ut dirigeret viam ejus ad liberationem populi sui."

Eccli. XXVI. 28.

"Duæ species difficiles et periculosæ mihi apparuerunt: difficile exuitur negotians a negligentia: et non justificabitur caupo a peccatis labiorum."

Eccli. XXX. 12.

"Curva cervicem ejus in juventute, et tunde latera ejus, dum infans est, ne forte induret, et non credat tibi: et erit tibi dolor animæ."

Const. Apost. Lib. II. 21.

"Multi quippe sunt malevolii dicaces, *tertiā linguam* habentes."

Ibid. XXXVII.

"—ut olim Babylone duo senes adversum Susannam—."
(The same allusion is repeated in the XLIX. Chapter.)

Ibid. L. 1.

"Quoniam Susannam quidem Dominus per Danielelem eripuit e manibus iniquorum; reos autem sanguinis feminae senes ad ignem damnavit: vobis vero per Danielelem exprobravit dicens: 'Sic fatui filii Israel, non dijudicantes, neque quod manifestum est cognoscentes, condemnastis filiam Israel? Revertimini ergo ad iudicium, quia falsum testimonium isti locuti sunt adversus eam.' "

Lib. III. 6.

"Quemadmodum ergo sapientissima Juditha, pudicitiae testimonio celebris, nocte ac die Deum pro Israel deprecabatur"

Lib. IV. 6.

"—quia non justificabitur caupo de peccato—."

Lib. IV. 11.

"Et adhuc: Tunde latera ejus, dum infans est, ne forte induratus non credat tibi."

Esther IV. 16.

"Vade et congrega omnes Judæos, quos in Susan repereris, et orate pro me. Non comedatis, et non bibatis tribus diebus et tribus noctibus, et ego cum ancillis meis similiter jejunabo: et tunc ingrediar ad regem contra legem faciens, non vocata, tradensque me morti et periculo."

Judith, VIII. 6.

"— et habens super lumbos suos cilicium, jejunabat omnibus diebus vitæ suæ, præter sabbata, et neomenias, et festa domus Israel."

Eccli. XXIV. 35.

"—qui implet quasi Phison sapientiam, et sicut Tigris in diebus novorum—."

Eccli. XXV. 36.

"A carnibus tuis abscinde il- lam, ne semper te abutatur."

Eccli. V. 8.

"Non tardes converti ad Do- minum, et ne differas de die in diem—."

Baruch IV. 4.

"Beati sumus, Israel: quia quæ Deo placent, manifesta sunt nobis."

Sap. III. 1.

"Justorum autem animæ in manu Dei sunt, et non tanget illos tormentum mortis."

Lib. V. 20.

"Item Esthera et Mardo- chæus, et Juditha insultationem impiorum Holophernis et Am- anis jejunando declinarunt."

Lib. VI. 5.

"—detractoque eis Spiritu sancto ac imbre prophetico, im- plevit ecclesiam suam gratia spirituali, velut fluvium Ægypti in *diebus novorum*."

Ibid. 14.

"Abscinde enim eam," in- quit, "a carnibus tuis."

Ibid. 15.

"Ne differas enim converti ad Dominum."

Ibid. 23.

"Beati sumus, Israel, quia quæ placita sunt Deo manifesta sunt nobis."

Ibid. 30.

"Justorum animæ in manu Dei."

Sap. II. 23, 24.

"Quoniam Deus creavit hominem inextermabilem, et ad imaginem similitudinis suæ fecit illum. Invidia autem diaboli mors introivit in orbem terrarum:—."

Tob. IV. 16.

"Quod ab alio oderis fieri tibi vide, ne tu aliquando alteri facias."


Esther XIV. 12.

"Memento, Domine, et ostende te nobis in tempore tribulationis nostræ, et da mihi fiduciam, Domine, rex deorum et universæ potestatis—."

I. Mac. II.

Judith VIII.

Dan. XIII. 42.

"Exclamavit autem  voce magna Susanna, et dixit: Deus æterne, qui absconditorum es cognitor, qui nosti omnia, antequam fiant—."

Judith VIII.

Lib. VII. 1.

"—naturale quidem est vitæ iter, adscitum autem iter mortis; non illius quæ ex voluntate Dei exstitit, verum illius quæ ex insidiis diaboli."

Ibid. 2.

"Omne quod non vis tibi fieri, et tu hoc alteri ne facias."

Ibid. 33.

"Æterne Salvator noster, *rex deorum*."

Ibid. 37.

"Tu, Domine Deus, nunc quoque suscipe preces labiis prolatis populi tui congregati ex gentibus . . . sicut suscepisti munera justorum in eorum sæculis . . . Mathathiæ et filiorum ejus in zelo tuo—."

Lib. VIII. 2.

"Sed et mulieres prophetaverunt . . . Holda et Juditha."

Ibid. 5.

"Qui es vere, Dominus Deus omnipotens, . . . qui omnia nosti antequam fiant—."

Ibid. 25.

"Vidua non ordinatur; sed si multo ante amisit virum, et caste et inculpabiliter vixit, ac domesticorum optime curam gessit ut Juditha—."

Sap. III. 1.

(Already quoted.)

Ibid. 41.

"—quia cunctorum animæ apud te vivent, et spiritus justorum in manu tua sunt, quos non tanget cruciatus."

Eccli. XXXI. 35.

"Vinum in jucunditatem creatum est, et non in ebrietatem, ab initio."

Ibid. 44.

"Hoc autem dicimus non ut vinum nequaquam bibant: eo enim modo contumelia afficerent id *quod a Deo factum est ad lætitiā.*"

For the tradition of the African Church, we turn to the two great lights of that Church Tertullian and Cyprian.*

*Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus was the son of a centurion in the Roman armies stationed in Proconsular Africa. It appears evident that he had first given himself to a forensic career. The faith and constancy of the Martyrs impressed him deeply, and in the fourth year of the reign of Septimius Severus he embraced the faith of Jesus Christ. At Carthage he was ordained priest, and passed thence to Rome, where he published his Apology for the Christians, a masterpiece of erudition and eloquence. Tertullian was endowed by nature with a capacious mind, endowed with a peculiar ardor and natural severity. For some years he used his splendid powers for the best interests of the Christian Church. He was naturally inclined to that which was rigorous. He seemed to find a lack of severity in the Gospels of the Christian dispensation. This natural impetuosity made him a prey to the fanatic Montanus. A very probable opinion sustains that baffled ambition and the opposition of the clergy of Rome conspired to cause his defection. Montanus pretended that God, having failed to save the world by Moses, the Prophets, and even by the Incarnation, had sent the Holy Spirit into him to execute the salvation of the elect. He associated with himself Priscilla and Maximilla, two women of high rank but of immoral lives. They affected great austerity, and rigid fasts. They forbade second marriages, denied the absolving power of the Church for certain sins, and considered flight from persecution as apostasy. They laid claim to prophecy, inveighed against the hierarchy of the Church, proclaimed that they were to raise the Christians from their spiritual infancy in which they had hitherto lived. The apparent severity of their morals drew many to the sect, but being founded on a violent misconception, it failed. Montanus is said by Eusebius to have hanged himself. The last years of Tertullian's life were spent in this wretched heresy, and he wrote many of his works while a Montanist. There is no good evidence that he ever abandoned the error. Tertullian's works may be divided into two classes; those written before his lapse into Montanism, and those written after. The first class includes *Apologia pro Christianis*, *Libri duo ad Nationes*, *De Testimonio Animæ*, *ad Martyres*, *De*

Dan. XIII. 32.

"At iniqui illi jusserunt ut discooperiretur (erat enim cooperta) ut vel sic satiarentur decore ejus."

II. Mac. VII. 28.

"Peto, nate, ut aspicias ad cælum et terram, et ad omnia quæ in eis sunt: et intelligas, quia ex nihilo fecit illa Deus, et hominum genus—."

An evident allusion to the
Benedictus of Dan. III.
24-90.

Judith passim.

Eccli. XI. 14.

"Bona et mala, vita et mors, paupertas et honestas a Deo sunt."

Dan. III. 24-90.

Tertull. De Corona IV. A.

"Si et Susanna in judicio revelata argumentum velandi præstat—."

Adversus Hermogenem XXI.

"Ita si ex nihilo Deus cuncta fecisse non potuit, *Scriptura* non adjecisset *illum ex nihilo fecisse*—."

Ibid. XLIV.

"—cui etiam inanimalia et incorporalia laudes canunt apud Danielelem."

Adversus Marcionem, Lib. I.
VII.

"Si communio nominum conditionibus præjudicat, quanti nequam servi regum nominibus insultant, Alexandri, et Darii et *Holophernis*?"

Ibid. XVI.

"Cur in hac sola specie uniformen eum capiunt, visibilium solummodo *et vitam et mortem et mala et pacem*."

Adversus Marcionem, Lib. V.
11.

"Quod non alius quam Creator intelligitur qui et universa benedixit, habes *Genesisim*; et

Spectaculis, De Idololatria, Ad Scapulam, De Oratione, De Baptismo, De Pœnitentia, De Patientia, Ad Uxorem, libri duo, De Cultu Feminum, lib. II. In the second class are De Corona Militis, De Fuga in Persecutione, Adversus Gnosticos, Adversus Praxeam, Adversus Hermogenem, Adversus Marcionem, lib. V., Adversus Valentinianos, Adversus Judæos, De Anima, De Carne Christi, De Resurrectione Carnis, De Velandis Virginibus, De Exhortatione Castitatis, De Monogamia, De Jejuniis, De Pudicitia, De Pallio.

It is uncertain whether the work De Præscriptionibus was written before or after his defection.

Sap. I. 1.

Diligite justitiam, qui iudicatis terram. Sentite de Domino in bonitate, et in simplicitate cordis quærite illum.

Eccli. XLIV. 17.

"Noe inventus est perfectus, justus, et in tempore iracundiæ factus est reconciliatio."

I. Mac. passim.

Sap. I. 6.

"Benignus est enim spiritus sapientiæ, et non liberabit maledicum a labiis suis: quoniam renum illius testis est Deus, et cordis illius scrutator est verus, et linguæ ejus auditor."

Eccli. XV. 18.

"Ante hominem vita et mors, bonum et malum: quod placuerit ei, dabitur illi—."

Baruch VI. 3-5.

"Nunc autem videbitis in Babylonia deos aureos, et argenteos, et lapideos, et ligneos in humeris portari, ostentantes metum Gentibus. Videte ergo ne et vos similes efficiamini factis alienis, et metuatis, et metus vos capiat in ipsis. Visa itaque turba de retro, et ab

ab universis benedicitur, habes Danielelem."

Adversus Valentinianos II.

"Porro facies Dei spectat in simplicitate quærentes, ut docet ipsa *Sophia*, non quidem Valentini sed Salomonis."

Adversus Judæos II.

"Nam unde *Noe justus inventus*—?"

Ibid. IV.

"Nam et temporibus Maccabæorum, Sabbatis pugnando, fortiter fecerunt, et hostes allophylos expugnaverunt, legemque paternam ad pristinum vitæ statum, pugnando Sabbatis, revocaverunt."

De Anima XV.

"Si enim scrutatorem et dispectorem cordis Deum legimus—."

De Monogamia XIV.

"Ecce, inquit, posui ante te bonum et malum: elige quod bonum est."

Adversus Gnosticos VIII.

"Meminerant enim et Jeremiæ scribentis ad eos quibus illa captivitas imminebat: 'Et nunc videbitis deos Babyloni-orum aureos et argenteos et ligneos portari super humeros, ostentantes nationibus timorem. Cavete igitur ne et vos consimiles sitis allophylis, et

ante, adorantes, dicite in cordibus vestris: Te oportet adorari, Domine."

Dan. XIV. 3-24.

"Rex quoque colebat eum, et ibat per singulos dies adorare eum: porro Daniel adorabat Deum suum. Dixitque ei rex: Quare non adoras Bel? Dixitque Daniel: Dominum Deum meum adoro: quia ipse est Deus vivens: iste autem non est Deus vivens."

Sap. I. 1.

(Already quoted.)

Eccli. XI. 30.

"Ante mortem ne laudes hominem quemquam, quoniam in filiis suis agnoscitur vir."

timore capiamini, dum aspicitis turbas adorantes retro eos et ante: sed dicite in animo vestro: te, Domine, adorare debemus.' "

De Idololatria XVIII.

"—statimque apparuisset Daniele idolis non deservisse, nec *Bel nec draconem*; colere quod multo postea apparuit."

De Præscriptionibus VII.

"Nostra institutio de porticu Salomonis est, qui et ipse tradiderat, Dominum in simplicitate cordis esse quærendum."

*Cyprian. Epist. V. 2.

"—cum *scriptum sit*: 'Ante mortem ne laudes hominem quemquam.' "

*Closely allied with Tertullian, is St. Cyprian. He declares himself that Tertullian had been his master. The style of Tertullian is rough, and tinged with certain African barbarisms. In the words of Balzac: "Tertullian's is an iron style, but it must be allowed that with this metal he has forged excellent weapons." Cyprian tempers the roughness of his master, but still he retains much of the genius of his country. He has been called by Lactantius the first eloquent father of the Latin Church. Cyprian was descended from an illustrious, rich family in Proconsular Africa in the first half of the third century. As a pagan, he first devoted himself to eloquence. He was converted through the labors of the priest Cæcilius in 246, A. D. He sold what he had, and gave to the poor, embraced continency, took the habit of a philosopher, and substituted the reading of the Sacred Scriptures for that of the profane authors. His great talents placed him in the Episcopal see of Carthage in 248. His labors in the see of Carthage were immense. He was the father of the poor, the light of the clergy and the consoler of the people. The Decian persecution forced him to flee from his see for some years, but he again returned to his post. The character of Cyprian was firm and uncompromising. When he was accused before Pope Cornelius by Privatus, he sent no defense to Rome. To the Pope, who asked an explanation of this, he responded, that it was established

Dan XIII.

Idem. Epist. XL. 4.

"Nec ætas vos eorum, nec auctoritas fallat, qui ad duorum presbyterorum veterem nequitiam respondentes, sicut illi Susannam pudicam corrumpere et violare conati sunt, sic et hi," etc.

Sap. III. 11.

Idem. Epist. LXII. 1.

"Sapientiam enim et disciplinam qui abjicit, infelix est: et vacua est spes illorum, et labores sine fructu, et inutilia opera eorum."

"—et iterum scriptum sit: 'Disciplinam qui abjicit infelix est.' "

Ecc. VII. 29-31.

Idem. Epist. LXVI.

"—honora patrem tuum, et gemitus matris tuæ ne obliviscaris—. In tota anima tua time Dominum, et sacerdotes illius sanctifica."

"Et iterum (Salomon): 'Honora Deum ex tota anima tua, et honorifica sacerdotes ejus.' "

Eccli. XXVIII. 28.

Idem. LXIX. 7.

"Sepi aures tuas spinis, linguam nequam noli audire, et ori tuo facito ostia et seras."

"—nec recordaris scriptum esse: 'Sepi aures tuas spinis, et noli audire linguam nequam.' "

Eccli. XXXIV. 30.

Idem. Epist. LXXI. 1.

"Qui baptizatur a mortuo, et iterum tangit eum; quid proficit lavatio illius?"

"— non considerantes scriptum esse: 'Qui baptizatur a mortuo, quid proficit lavatio ejus?' "

among the Bishops that a crime should be examined where it was committed. This natural firmness led Cyprian to oppose Pope Stephen in the celebrated question of the baptism by heretics. The only justification that can be offered for Cyprian is, that the Pope's province in the Church was not so well understood then as now. Hatred of heresy led him into an error that was by no means formal. He suffered martyrdom for the faith in 258. Whatever was blameworthy in his contention with Pope Stephen was washed out in the blood of martyrdom. He was a prolific writer. His chief works are: Eighty-three Epistles, De Habitu Virginis, De Lapsis, De Unitate Ecclesiæ, Ad Demetrianum, De Idolorum Vanitate, De Mortalitate, De Opere et Eleemosynis, De Bono Patientiæ, De Zelo et Livore, Ad Fortunatum, Ad Quirinum.

Sap. III. 4-8.

"Etsi coram hominibus tormenta passi sunt, spes illorum immortalitate plena est. In paucis vexati in multis bene disponentur, quoniam Deus tentavit eos, et invenit illos dignos se. Tamquam aurum in fornace probavit illos, et quasi holocausti hostiam accepit illos, et in tempore erit respectus illorum."

Sap. III. 11.

(Already quoted.)

Sap. V. 8, 9.

"Quid nobis profuit superbia? aut divitiarum jactantia quid contulit nobis? Transierunt omnia illa tamquam umbra, et tamquam nuntius percurrens—."

Dan. XIV. 30 et seqq.

"Qui miserunt eum in lacum leonum; et erat ibi diebus sex."

Tob. XII. 7.

"Etenim sacramentum regis abscondere bonum est: opera autem Dei revelare et confiteri, honorificum est."

Sap. V. 1-9.

"Tunc stabunt justi in magna constantia adversus eos, qui se angustiaverunt, et qui abstulerunt labores eorum," etc.

Idem. Epist. LXXXI. 2.

Et iterum ubi loquitur *Scriptura divina* de tormentis quæ Martyres Dei consecrant, et in ipsa possessionis probatione sanctificant: 'Et si coram hominibus tormenta passi sunt, spes eorum immortalitate plena est. Et in paucis vexati in multis bene disponentur—.' "

De Habitu Virginum I.

"Et denuo legimus: 'Discipulinam qui abjicit, infelix est.' "

Ibid. X.

"— cum dicat *Scriptura divina*: 'Quid nobis profuit superbia? aut quid divitiarum jactatio contulit nobis? Transierunt omnia illa tamquam umbra.' "

De Oratione Dominica XXI.

"Sic Danieli in leonum lacu jussu regis incluso prandium divinitus procuratur, et inter feras esurientes et parcentes homo Dei pascitur."

Ibid. XXXIII.

"Sic et Raphael angelus Tobiae oranti semper, et semper operanti testis fuit dicens: 'Opera Dei revelare et confiteri, honorificum est—.' "

De Idolorum Vanitate, XXIV.

"Et iterum (dicit *Sancta Scriptura*): 'Tunc stabunt justi in magna constantia adversus eos qui se angustiaverunt,' "etc.

Eccli. II. 1-4, 5.

"Fili, accedens ad servitum Dei, sta in iustitia et timore, et præpara animam tuam ad tentationem. Omne quod tibi applicitum fuerit, accipe, et in dolore sustine, et in humilitate tua patientiam habe: quoniam in igne probatur aurum et argentum, homines vero receptibiles, in camino humiliationis."

Tob. II. 16.

"Ubi est spes tua, pro qua eleemosynas, et sepulturas faciebas?"

Tob. XII. 11-15.

(Already quoted.)

Eccli. III, 33.

"Ignem ardentem extinguit aqua, et eleemosyna resistit peccatis—."

Tob. XII. 8.

"Bona est oratio cum jejunio, et eleemosyna magis quam thesaurus auri recondere—."

Tob. XIV. 10, 11.

"Audite ergo, filii mei, patrem vestrum: Servite Domino in veritate, et inquirete ut faciatis quæ placita sunt illi: et filiis vestris mandate ut faciant

De Mortalitate, IX.

"Docet et præmonet *Scriptura divina* dicens: 'Fili, accedens ad servitum Dei, sta in iustitia et timore, et præpara animam tuam ad tentationem.

Et iterum: 'In dolore sustine, et in humilitate tua patientiam habe, quoniam in igne probatur aurum et argentum, homines vero receptibiles, in camino humiliationis.' "

Ibid. X.

"Et Tobias post opera magnifica . . . quem et ipsum uxor depravare tentavit dicens: 'Ubi sunt iustitiæ tuæ? Ecce quæ pateris.' "

Ibid.

"Quem postmodum Raphael Angelus collaudat, et dicit: 'Opera Dei revelare et confiteri honorificum est—.' "

De Opere et Eleemosynis II.

"Item denuo dicit: 'Sicut aqua extinguit ignem, sic eleemosyna extinguit peccatum.' "

Ibid. V.

"Raphael quoque Angelus. . . hortatur dicens: 'Bona est oratio cum jejunio et eleemosyna, quia eleemosyna a morte liberat et ipsa purgat peccata,' "

Ibid. XX.

"Et nunc, filii, mando tibi: 'servi Deo in veritate et fac coram illo quod illi placet: et filiis manda ut faciant justitiam et eleemosynas, et sint mem-

justitias et eleemosynas, ut sint memores Dei, et benedicant eum in omni tempore in veritate, et in tota virtute sua."

Tob. IV. 2-16.

"—dixitque ei: Audi, fili mi, verba oris mei, et ea in corde tuo, quasi fundamentum construe. . . . Omnibus autem diebus vitæ tuæ in mente habeto Deum: et cave ne aliquando peccato consentias, et prætermittas præcepta Domini Dei nostri, etc."

Eccli. II. 4.

"Omne, quod tibi applicitum fuerit, accipe: et in dolore sustine, et in humilitate tua patientiam habe—."

Tob. Passim.

Sap. XV. 15-17.

"—quoniam omnia idola nationum deos æstimaverunt," etc.

Sap. XIII. 1-4.

"Vani autem sunt omnes homines, in quibus non subest scientia Dei: et de his, quæ videntur bona, non potuerunt intelligere eum, qui est, neque operibus attendentes agnoverunt quis esset artifex: sed aut

ores Dei, et benedicant nomen ejus omni tempore.' "

Ibid.

"Et iterum: 'Omnibus diebus vitæ tuæ, fili dilectissime, in mente habeto Deum: et cave ne aliquando peccato consentias, et præcepta Domini Dei nostri,' " etc.

De Dono Patientiæ XVII.

"—sicut scriptum est: 'In dolore sustine, et in humilitate tua patientiam habe, quoniam in igne probatur aurum et argentum.' "

Ibid. XVIII.

"Tobias quoque post justitiæ et misericordiæ suæ opera magnifica, luminum amissione tentatus, in quantum patienter cæcitatem pertulit, intantum granditer Deum patientiæ laude promeruit."

De Exhortatione Martyrii I.

"In Sapientia Salomonis: 'Omnia idola nationum æstimaverunt deos—."

Ibid.

"Item apud Salomonem de elementis: 'Neque opera attendentes agnoverunt, quis esset artifex: sed aut ignem, aut spiritum, aut citatum aërem, aut gyrum stellarum, aut nimiam aquam, aut solem et lu-

ignem, aut spiritum, aut citatum ærem, aut gyrum stellarum, aut nimiam aquam, aut solem et lunam, rectores orbis terrarum deos putaverunt. Quorum si specie delectati, deos putaverunt: sciant quanto his dominator eorum speciosior est; speciei enim generator hæc omnia constituit. Aut si virtutem, et opera eorum mirati sunt, intelligant ab illis, quoniam qui hæc fecit, fortior est illis—.”

Eccli. II. 5.

“—quoniam in igne probatur aurum et argentum, homines vero receptibiles, in camino humiliationis.”

Dan. XIV. 4.

“Qui respondens, ait ei: Quia non colo idola manufacta, sed viventem Deum, qui creavit cælum, et terram, et habet potestatem omnis carnis.”

Tob. XIII. 6.

“Aspicite ergo quæ fecit nobiscum, et cum timore et tremore confitemini illi: regemque sæculorum exaltate in operibus vestris.”

II. Mac. VII. 9.

“—et in ultimo spiritu constitutus, sic ait: Tu quidem sceleratissime, in præsentī vita nos perdis: sed Rex mundi defunctos nos pro suis legibus in æternæ vitæ resurrectione suscitabit.”

nam, rectores orbis terrarum deos putaverunt. Quorum si specie delectati deos putaverunt, sciant, quanto his dominator eorum speciosior est: speciei enim generator hæc omnia constituit. Aut, si virtutem et opera eorum mirati sunt, intelligant ab illis, quoniam qui hæc fecit, fortior est illis.’ ”

Ad Fortunatum IX.

“Et iterum apud Salomonem: ‘Vasa figuli probat fornax homines justos, tentatio tribulationis.’ ”

Ibid. XI.

“Et Daniel, Deo devotus et Sancto Spiritu plenus, exclamat et dicit: ‘Nihil colo ego nisi Dominum Deum meum, qui condidit cælum et terram.’ ”

Ibid.

“Tobias quoque . . . prædicat dicens: ‘Ego in terra captivitatis meæ confiteor illi, et ostendo virtutem ejus in natione peccatrice.’ ”

Ibid.

“At ille (Martyr Maccabaicus) in martyrio suo fidens, et resurrectionis sibi præmium de Dei remuneratione promittens, exclamavit et dixit: ‘Tu quidem impotens, ex hac presenti vita nos perdis, sed mundi rex

II. Mac. VII. 1-41.

defunctos nos pro suis legibus
in æternam vitæ resurrectione
suscitabit." "

Prosequitur et refert mortem
septem Fratrum et matris eor-
um.

1I. Mac. VI. 30.

"Sed, cum plagis perimere-
tur, ingemuit, et dixit: Dom-
ine, qui habes sanctam scien-
tiam, manifeste tu scis, quia,
cum a morte possem liberari,
duros corporis sustineo dolores:
secundum animam vero prop-
ter timorem tuum libenter hæc
patior."

Ibid.

"Atille (Eleazar) ingemiscens
ait: 'Domine, qui sanctam
habes scientiam, manifestum
est quia cum possem a morte
liberari, durissimos dolores
corporis tolero, flagellis vapu-
lans; animo autem propter tui
ipsius metum libenter hæc pa-
tior.' "

Sap. III. 4-8.

"Etsi coram hominibus," etc.

Ibid. XII.

"Per Salomonem Spiritus
Sanctus ostendit, et præcinit
dicens: 'Et si coram homini-
bus,' " etc

Sap. V. 1-9.

"Tunc stabunt justi in mag-
na constantia adversus eos, qui
se angustiauerunt," etc.

Ibid.

"Item apud eundem vindicta
nostra describitur . . . : 'Tunc
stabunt justi in magna constan-
tia adversus eos qui se angus-
tiauerunt,' " etc.

Ad Quirinum (Vocantur quo-
que hi tres libri, Testi-
monia adversus Judæos)

Tob. XII. 15.

"Ego enim sum Raphael An-
gelus, unus ex septem, qui ad-
stamus ante Dominum."

Lib. I. XX.

"—ut angeli septem qui as-
sistunt et conversantur ante
faciem Dei, sicut Raphaël an-
gelus in Tobia dicit."

Eccli. XXIV. 5-20.

"Ego ex ore Altissimi pro-
divi primogenita ante omnem

Ibid. Lib. II. I.

"Item apud eundem Salom-
onem in Ecclesiastico: 'Ego ex

creaturam: ego feci in cœlis," etc.

Sap. II. 12-17.

"Circumveniamus ergo justum," etc.

Tob. II. 2.

"—dixit filio suo: Vade, et adduc aliquos de tribu nostra, timentes Deum, ut epulentur nobiscum."

Tob. IV. 5-11.

"Cum autem et ipsa compleverit tempus vitæ suæ, sepelias eam circa me. Omnibus autem diebus vitæ tuæ, in mente habeto," etc.

II. Mac. XI. 12.

"—et cum nec ipse jam foetorem suum ferre posset, ita ait: Justum est, subditum esse Deo, et mortalem non paria Deo sentire."

I. Mac. II. 62, 63.

"Et a verbis viri peccatoris ne timueritis, quia gloria ejus stercus et vermis est. Hodie extollitur, et cras non invenietur: quia conversus est in terram suam, et cogitatio ejus periit."

ore Altissimi prodivi, primogenita ante omnem creaturam. Ego in cœlis feci,' " etc.

Ibid. Lib. II. XIV.

"In Sapientia Salomonis: 'Circumveniamus justum,' " etc.

Ibid. Lib. III. I.

"De hoc ipso apud Tobiam: 'Et dixit Tobias filio suo: Vade et adduc quemcumque pauperem inveneris ex fratribus nostris, qui tamen in mente habeat Deum ex toto corde suo. Hunc adduc, et manducabit pariter meum prandium hoc. Ecce sustineo te, fili, donec venias.' "

Ibid.

"Item illic: 'Omnibus diebus vitæ tuæ, fili, Deum in mente habe,' " etc.

Ibid. IV.

"De hoc ipso in Maccabæis: 'Justum est subditum Deo esse, et mortalem non paria Deo sentire.' "

Ibid.

"Item illic: 'Et verba viri peccatoris ne timueritis, quia gloria ejus, in stercora erit, et in vermes. Hodie extollitur, et cras non invenietur: quoniam conversus est in terram suam, et cogitatio ejus periit.' "

Eccli. XXVII. 6.

"Vasa figuli probat fornax; et homines justos, tentatio tribulationis."

Tob. II. 22.

"Ad hæc uxor ejus irata respondit: Manifeste vana facta est spes tua, et eleemosynæ tuæ modo apparuerunt."

Eccli. XXIII. 11.

"Sicut enim servus interrogatus assidue, a livore non minuitur, sic omnis jurans, et nominans, in toto a peccato non purgabitur."

Sap. III. 4.

(Oft quoted.)

I. Mac. II. 52.

"Abraham, nonne in tentatione inventus est fidelis, et reputatum est ei ad justitiam?"

Sap. V. 1-9.

(Oft quoted.)

II. Mac. VII. 9-19.

(Oft quoted.)

Eccli. I. 16.

Initium sapientiæ, timor Domini; et cum fidelibus in vulva concreatus est, cum electis feminis graditur, et cum justis et fidelibus agnoscitur."

Ibid. VI.

"Apud Salomonem: 'Vasa figuli probat fornax; et homines justos, tentatio tribulationis.' "

Ibid.

"De hoc ipso in Tobia: 'Ubi sunt justitiæ tuæ? Ecce quæ pateris.' "

Ibid. XII.

"Apud Salomonem: 'Vir multum jurans replebitur iniquitate, et non discedet a domo ejus plaga; et si vane juraverit, non justificabitur.' "

Ibid. XV.

"De hoc ipso in Sapientia Salomonis: 'Et si coram hominibus,' " etc. (Oft quoted.)

Ibid.

"De hoc ipso in Maccabæis: 'Abraham, nonne in tentatione inventus est fidelis, et deputatum est ei ad justitiam?' "

Ibid. XVI.

"Item (Salomon) illic: 'Tunc stabunt justi in magna,' " etc. (Oft quoted.)

Ibid. XX.

"De hoc ipso in Maccabæis: Domine, qui sanctam habes scientiam,' " etc. (Oft quoted.)

Ibid. XX.

"De hoc ipso in Sapientia Salomonis: 'Initium Sapientiæ metuere Deum.' "

Dan. XIII. 1-3.

Ibid.

"Item in Danieli: 'Fuit vir habitans in Babylonia cui nomen erat Joachim, et accepit uxorem nomine Susannam, filiam Helciæ, formosam valde ac timentem Deum, et erant parentes ejus justi et docuerunt filiam suam secundum legem Moysi.' "

Eccli. X. 29.

Ibid. XLI.

"Noli extollere te in faciendo opere tuo, et noli cunctari in tempore angustiae."

"Apud Salomonem in Ecclesiastico: 'Noli te extollere in faciendo opere tuo.' "

Sap. I. 1.

Ibid. LIII.

"Diligite justitiam, qui iudicatis terram. Sentite de Domino in bonitate, et in simplicitate cordis quærite illum—."

"Item apud Salomonem in Sapientia: 'Et in simplicitate cordis quærite illum.' "

I. Mac. II. 60.

Ibid.

"Daniel in sua simplicitate liberatus est de ore leonum."

"Item in Maccabæis: 'Daniel in sua simplicitate liberatus est de ore leonum.' "

Sap. IV. 11-14.

Ibid. LVIII.

"—raptus est ne malitia mutaret intellectum ejus, aut ne fictio deciperet animam illius. Placita enim erat Deo, anima illius," etc.

"Item in Sapientia Salomonis: 'Raptus est ne malitia mutaret intellectum ejus. Placita enim erat Deo anima illius.' "

Sap. XV. 15-17.

Ibid. LIX.

"Omnia idola nationum," etc.

"In Sapientia Salomonis: 'Omnia idola nationum,' " etc. (Oft quoted.)

Sap. XIII. 1-4.

Ibid.

(Already quoted.)

"De hoc ipso: 'Neque opera attendentes cognoverunt,' " etc. (Already quoted.)

Tob. IV. 12 (juxta Græcum.)

"Uxorem accipe ex semine parentum tuorum, et noli sumere alienam mulierem quæ non est ex tribu parentum tuorum."

Sap. III. 11.

"Disciplinam qui abjicit, infelix est."

Eccli. IX. 22.

"Viri justī sint tibi convivæ, et in timore Dei sit tibi gloriatio."

Eccli. VI. 16.

"Amicus fidelis, medicamentum vitæ et immortalitatis: et qui metuunt Dominum, inveniunt illum."

Eccli. IX. 18.

"Longe abesto ab homine potestatem habente occidendi, et non suspicaberis timorem."

Eccli. XXV. 12.

"Beatus, qui invenit amicum verum, et qui enarrat justitiam auri audienti."

Eccli. XXVIII. 28.

"Sepi aures tuas spinis, et noli audire linguam nequam."

Eccli. IV. 34.

"Noli citatus esse in lingua tua: et inutilis, et remissus in operibus tuis."

Ibid. LXII.

"Apud Tobiam: 'Uxorem accipe ex semine parentum tuorum, et noli sumere alienam mulierem quæ non est ex tribu parentum tuorum.'"

Ibid. LXVI.

"Item in Sapiencia Salomonis: 'Disciplinam qui abjicit, infelix est.'"

Ibid. XCV.

"Item apud eundem in Ecclesiastico: 'Viri justī sint tibi convivæ.'"

Ibid.

"Et iterum: 'Amicus fidelis, medicamentum vitæ et immortalitatis.'"

Ibid.

"Item illic: 'Longe abesto ab homine potestatem habente occidendi, et non suspicaberis timorem.'"

Ibid.

"Item illic: 'Beatus qui invenit amicum verum, et qui enarrat justitiam auri audienti—.'"

Ibid.

"Item illic: 'Sepi aures tuas spinis, et noli audire linguam nequam.'"

Ibid. XCVI.

"Apud Salomonem in Ecclesiastico: 'Noli citatus esse in lingua tua, et inutilis et remissus in operibus tuis.'"

Eccli. V. 8, 9.

"Non tardes converti ad Dominum, et ne differas de die in diem; subito enim veniet ira illius, et in tempore vindictæ disperdet te."

Eccli. VII. 39.

"Non te pigeat visitare infirmum: ex his enim in dilectione firmaberis."

Eccli. XXVIII. 15.

"Susurro et bilinguis maledictus: multos enim turbabit pacem habentes."

Eccli. XXXIV. 23.

"Dona iniquorum non probat Altissimus," etc.

Sap. VI. 6, 7.

"Horrende et cito apparebit vobis: quoniam iudicium durissimum his, qui præsunt, fiet. Exiguo enim conceditur misericordia; potentes autem potenter tormenta patientur."

Eccli. IV. 10, 11.

"Esto pupillis misericors ut pater; et pro viro matri illorum, et eris velut filius Altissimi, si obedieris."

Eccli. II. 1.

"Fili, accedens ad servitutum Dei, sta in iustitia, et timore, et præpara animam tuam ad tentationem."

Ibid. XCVII.

"Apud Salomonem in Ecclesiastico: 'Ne tardes converti ad Deum, et ne differas de die in diem. Subito enim venit ira illius.'"

Ibid. CIX.

"Apud Salomonem in Ecclesiastico: 'Ne pigriteris visitare infirmum. Ex his enim in dilectione firmaberis.'"

Ibid. CX.

"In Ecclesiastico apud Salomonem: 'Susurro et bilinguis maledictus. Multos enim turbabit pacem habentes.'"

Ibid. CXI.

"Apud eundem: 'Dona iniquorum non probat Altissimus.'"

Ibid. CXII.

"Apud Salomonem: 'Iudicium durissimum in his qui præsunt fiet. Exiguo enim conceditur misericordia; potentes autem potenter tormenta patientur.'"

Ibid. CXIII.

"Apud Salomonem: 'Esto pupillis misericors ut pater; et pro viro matri illorum; et eris velut filius Altissimi si obedieris.'"

De Laude Martyrii XIV.

"Fili, inquit Dominus, accedens ad servitutum Dei, sta in iustitia et timore, et præpara animam tuam ad tentationem."

Eccli. II. 4.

"Omne, quod tibi applicitum fuerit, accipe: et in dolore sustine, et in humilitate tua patientiam habe—."

Ibid. XVI.

"Scriptum est et legimus: 'In dolore sustine, et in humilitate tua habe patientiam, quoniam per ignem probatur aurum et argentum.'"

Sap. III. 4.

(Oft quoted.)

Ibid.

"—sicut per Prophetam suum dixit: 'Et si coram hominibus,' " etc. (Oft quoted.)

These numerous quotations evince that the Church, for the first three centuries, received as Divine Scripture all the books which later, in the Council of Trent, she solemnly canonized. These quotations were a product of the life of the Church. The Fathers incorporated into their works these numerous quotations, not by means of Concordances of Holy Writ, or other easy method of reference, but because their Christian education had been mainly derived from the Holy Books. They spoke from the fund that they had assimilated from the spiritual food of the Church; and, hence, in these quotations, they are exponents not of their own opinions, but of the unanimous belief of a Church daily baptized in the blood of her martyrs.

Against this harmonious array of evidence from tradition, our adversaries bring certain objections, based upon the same source of information. Their Achilles to break the chain of tradition is Meliton, Bishop of Sardis.* The celebrated passage, a fragment from his *Ἐκλογών*, is as follows: "Meliton sends greeting to his brother Onesimus. As you have frequently desired, in your zeal for the Scriptures, that I should make selections for you both from the Law and the Prophets, respecting our Saviour and our whole faith; and you were moreover desirous of having an exact statement of the Old Testament; how many in number, and

*St. Meliton was bishop of Sardis in Lydia in the second half of the second century, under Marcus Aurelius. He presented to this prince in 171 an Apology for the Christians, remarkable for candor and truth. Of his numerous writings but small fragments have come down to us.

in what order the books were written, I have endeavored to perform this; for I know your zeal in the faith, and your great desire to acquire knowledge, and that especially by the love of God you prefer these matters to all others, thus striving to gain eternal life. When, therefore, I went to the East, and came as far as the place where these things were proclaimed and done, I accurately ascertained the books of the Old Testament, and send them to thee here below. The names are as follows: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy; Jesus Nave, (Joshua), Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two of Paralipomena, Psalms of David, Proverbs of Solomon, which is also called Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, Canticle of Canticles, Job, the Prophets Isaias, Jeremias, and of the twelve prophets one book, Daniel, Ezechiel, and Esdras. From these I have made six books of Selections."

This list omits Esther and all the deuterocanonical books. The omission of Esther has been variously explained. Some have attributed it to a lapse of memory; others to an error of the copyist. It is far more probable that such omission is due to the uncertainty and discussions that then existed among the Rabbis concerning this book. Meliton depends on the Jews entirely for his canon. He finds it necessary to go to their country to ascertain the true canon of the Old Testament. His exclusion, however, of the deuterocanonical books is not equivalent to their condemnation. In his *Clavis in S. Scripturam*, he employs Wisdom and a deuterocanonical fragment of Esther.

Sap. VIII. 1.
"Attingit ergo a fine usque
ad finem fortiter," etc.

Esther X. 12.
"—et recordatus est Dom-
inus populi sui," etc.

Ibid.
"—et in Salomone: 'Sapien-
tia Domini attingit a fine usque
ad finem fortiter.' "

Ibid.
"—et alibi: Recordatus est
Dominus populi sui.' "

There seems to have been in vogue at that time a distinction of the Sacred Writings of the Old Testament, founded more on their origin than on any internal difference. The

books which the Church had received from the Jews, and which were recognized by all, were termed *ὁμολογούμενοι*. The others were those that the Church had received from the Septuagint, and which the Jews rejected; these were the *ᾠμφιβαλλόμενοι*. Now there is no voice in tradition, with the sole exception of St. Jerome, that ever rejected these books. As witnesses of tradition, they make no discrimination between these two classes; but as critics, in which capacity they are of least worth, they sometimes omit these from the official list of the Holy Scriptures. It may be that some one among them doubted of the divinity of the writings. We are not seeking of them what they individually held, but what the Church of their day taught and believed.

In the growth and development of doctrine this has always been verified, that certain truths were less clearly conspicuous in the deposit of faith in the beginning, which afterwards grew to their full life in the body of the Church's doctrines. Meliton may have doubted; he does not deny. Other truths, which have been defined on the warrant of tradition, have encountered stronger opposition. St. Thomas strenuously denied the Immaculate Conception, and yet that truth triumphed, and finally entered among the defined dogmas. In tradition, we must lose sight of the individual, and of his private opinions, and seek only the faith of the Church reflected in his writings. Again, Meliton's position may be explained as only an indication of the greater extrinsic authority of the protocanonical books. The question in his day had not been defined by the Church. The protocanonical books could claim a sort of official promulgation, inasmuch as they were transmitted by the old custodians of Yahveh's law. The deuterocanonical books had only the *usage of the Christian people* in their favor. Now, in such case, a man, even though revering the second class as God's word, could rightly restrict the word canonical to the first class. All Catholics receive and honor all of Mary's prerogatives, but no one can place among the dogmas of faith her Assumption, and it is only in our own times that we may incorporate among the dogmas the Immaculate Conception. But even were we to concede the worst, that

Meliton rejected the deuterocanonical books, our thesis is not weakened. His would be the critical error of one man, availing naught against the voice of the Church of truth reverberating through the practical usage of the "pars docens" and "pars discens" of the Church.

The value of this proof from tradition is not impaired by the Fathers' occasional references to the Apocryphal books.

Tertullian, [*De Cultu Fœminarum* Lib. I. 3.] approves the Book of Henoch. "I know," he says, "that the work of Henoch which gives such order to the Angels is by some not received, because it is not admitted in the Jewish deposit. I believe that they judge that the book written before the deluge could not endure after such universal abolition of all things. If that is their plea, let them remember that the great grandson of Henoch survived the cataclysm of Noah; and he, forsooth, had heard and memorized in the domestic tradition his ancient progenitor's favor with God, and all his noted deeds; since Henoch commended naught else to his son, except that he hand down these things to posterity. Therefore, without doubt, Noah could succeed in the line of the tradition; and, moreover, he (Noah) would not have kept silent the disposition of God, his preserver, and the glory of his house. Moreover, by the Holy Spirit he (Noah) could have restored the Scripture that perished in the deluge, in the manner that Ezra restored the Jewish literature that was destroyed in the Babylonian captivity. Wherefore, since Henoch in that same Scripture announces concerning the Lord, in our judgment, nothing is to be rejected. And we read [*II. Tim. III. 16.*]: 'All Scripture having power to edify is divinely inspired.' It may rightly be thought that it is rejected by the Jews in the same manner as the other things which treat of Christ. Nor is it surprising that they reject the Scriptures which treat of him whom they rejected when he spoke in person to them. We add that Henoch has a testimony in the Epistle of Jude the Apostle, (*Jude I. 14.*)."

We shall see later on that Tertullian errs in saying that St. Jude quotes from Henoch. The sentence of Jude was taken from a tradition, which afterwards formed the basis

of the Apocryphal book of Henoch. The Epistle of Barnabas [IV. 3; XVI. 6.] quotes as divine Scripture the Book of Henoch; Clement of Alexandria quotes the IV. Book of Ezra as "Ezra the prophet." [III. Strom. 16.]

III. Ezra IV. 41.

"Et desiit loquendo. Et omnes populi clamaverunt, et dixerunt: Magna est veritas, et prævalet."

Ibid. IV. 37-41-47.

"Et omnes populi clamaverunt, et dixerunt: Magna est veritas, et prævalet."

St. Athanasius, Apolog. Ad Imp. 11.

"Hanc cum Zorobabel sapiens ille vir ceteris anteferebat, alios superavit, universusque populus in hanc vocem prorupit: 'Magna est veritas et prævalet.'"

Idem Sermo Major de Fide, 35.

"Quemadmodum et Ezra prophetico spiritu dicit ex persona Zorobabelis, idque de Filio Dei; 'Vivit veritas, et vincit, et roboratur, manetque in sæcula sæculorum.'"

Origen quotes from the same book:

Orig. Comment. in Josue, VI. Ex præfatione.

"Quia Ezræ tempore cum vinum et inimicum, regem ac denique mulieres vincit veritas, reædificatur templum Dei."

Orig. In Lib. Josue, Hom. IX. 10.

III. Ezra IV. 59, 60.
"—et dixit: Abs te est victoria, et abs te est sapientia et claritas. Et ego servus tuus sum. Benedictus es, qui dedisti mihi sapientiam, et tibi confitebor, Domine Deus patrum nostrorum."

"—ita ut et nos dicamus, sicut in Ezra scriptum est: 'Quia a te, Domine, est victoria, et ego servus tuus: benedictus es, Deus veritatis.'"

The chain of tradition is not broken by these few isolated references to some of the Apocrypha. In these few cases, the Fathers are exponents of their individual opinions, and

are to be valued only as mere individuals. They do not quote the Apocrypha as *witnesses of the belief of the Church*. The absolute line between the Canonical and Apocryphal books had not been promulgated by any definite authority, and, using their liberty as individuals, some few erroneously extended inspiration to certain books which never were factors in the life of the Church. This critical error then of the Fathers in these rare cases, prevails not against the solemn universal witness that the writers of these early ages bear to the approbation of the deuterocanonical books, in the practical usage of the Christian people.

Relying upon the certain data that we have adduced, we assert that if tradition be taken as the criterion of inspiration, and if the traditions are most valued that go back closest to the Apostolic age, then the deuterocanonical books of Holy Writ rest on a solid foundation.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CANON OF THE FATHERS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY AND FIRST YEARS OF FIFTH CENTURY.

In this period the unanimity which prevailed for the first three centuries is somewhat broken, especially by Jerome. The doubts which arose in this age concerning the deuterocanonical books prevailed more especially in the East. We find, however, that not one of the Fathers of this epoch, excepting Jerome, rejected the deuterocanonical books. Their opposition to them never passed beyond a mere doubt concerning them. We find, also, in this period, many in the East and in the West, who defend a canon identical with the Canon of Trent. Lastly, we find that "the very men who give a list of the Jewish books, evince an inclination to the Christian and enlarged Canon." Thus, we see, that the practical tradition of the Church was so powerful that it overcame in the life of the Church the doubts of individual men and isolated churches.

As we come down from the first ages of the Church the patristic data multiply, and, hence, we could not set forth here every particular writer's views and use of Holy Scrip-

ture. Neither is such now necessary. No one will deny that in this period Jerome is the only positive opponent of the deuterocanonical books. All likewise recognize that the most and the greatest of the Fathers of this epoch received these books as divine Scripture. Many adduce here the authority of the Council of Nice, 325. They believe that in that council there was formulated a catalogue of books which included the deuterocanonical Scripture. The proofs for the assertion of this are so feeble that we pretermit it here as worthless to establish our theory.*

The Council of Hippo A. D. 393, the Council of Carthage A. D. 397, and the second Council of Carthage in 419 A. D. officially promulgated canons of Scripture which included all the deuterocanonical books.

Council of Hippo, Can. 36:

"The Synod defines that besides the canonical Scriptures nothing be read in the Church under the name of

*Cornely defends the genuineness of the canon of Scripture of the Council of Nice. Among his proofs are the following:

1. St. Jerome in his preface to Judith declares that the Nicene Synod is said to have included the book of Judith among the canonical Scriptures. The proving force of this testimony is not very great, for any approbation of the book in the deliberations of the Council, would justify Jerome's statement. We believe that the Nicene fathers recognized the deuterocanonical books as divine Scripture, but we hold that it is not sufficiently substantiated by historical data, that they drew up an official list of the Holy Scriptures. Had they done so, it would have had a greater influence on the trend of thought of the Greek fathers. St. Athanasius would not have declared that it was a bold and difficult thing to fix the list of the Holy Books, had there been promulgated a catalogue of the same by a council of which he was an important factor, and whose decisions he venerated.

2. Cornely quotes some obscure words from Cassiodorus, reproduced from Hefele Conciliengesch. II. p. 486; but they form no forcible proof.

3. Cornely also adduces the 36th canon of the Council of Hippo, A. D. 393: "Ut præter Scripturas Catholicas, nihil in Ecclesia legatur. Capituli XXIV. Nicæni Concilii. Item ut præter Scripturas Catholicas nihil in ecclesia legatur sub nomine divinarum Scripturarum. Sunt autem Canonice Scripturæ," etc. The books of both canons are there mentioned. This Canon exists but in one sole codex in the Vallicellian library, in Rome. We are not disposed to detract from what force it may have, but we do not feel warranted to refer the Council of Nice among the proofs of the Canon in the fourth century. Hefele accords no certain authority to the aforesaid Canon.

divine Scripture. The Canonical Scriptures are: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Josue, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings (Regnorum), Paralipomena two books, Job, the Davidic Psalter, the *five books of Solomon*, the twelve (minor) Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezechiel, *Tobias*, *Judith*, Esther, Ezra two books, *Maccabees* two books." The first Council of Carthage, 397 A. D., confirms the same canon.

The second Council of Carthage, 419 A. D., has the following: "It is decreed that nothing but the canonical Scriptures may be read under the name of divine Scripture. The canonical Scriptures are the following: Of the Old Testament, Genesis, . . . Job, the Psalter, *five books of Solomon*, the Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, (Ezekiel is wanting) the Twelve (minor) Prophets, *Tobias*, *Judith*, Esther, two books of Ezra, *two books of Maccabees*. . . . This decree shall be made known to our brother and fellow priest Boniface, the Bishop of Rome, or even to the other bishops for its confirmation; for we *have received from the Fathers, that thus (the Scriptures) should be read in the Church.*"

Some have found it strange that the three African Councils were held at such short intervals. The reason of the repetitions of the Canon seems to be the fact that Catholic thought had been disturbed in those days by Jerome, who in his Prologus Galeatus to the Books of Kings, rejected out of the Canon the deuterocanonical books, A. D. 390. Repeatedly in his subsequent labors, he inveighs against the deuterocanonical books and fragments, and it was to retain the Catholics faithful to their old traditions that these three councils repeat their Canons in such quick succession.

No doubt can reasonably exist regarding St. Augustine's attitude towards the deuterocanonical Scriptures. He was an important factor in the three councils just mentioned; and repeatedly in his works he declares himself clearly for the deuterocanonical books. It would be a long and needless task to set forth Augustine's use of deuterocanonical Scripture. It will not be contradicted by any patristic scholar that Augustine held in equal veneration the proto-canonical and deuterocanonical books. He gives his views

of Scripture and a complete canon in the Enchiridion of Christian Doctrine, Book II. VIII.:

“But let us now go back to consider the third step here mentioned, for it is about it that I have set myself to speak and reason as the Lord shall grant me wisdom. The most skillful interpreter of the sacred writings, then, will be he who in the first place has read them all and retained them in his knowledge, if not yet with full understanding, still with such knowledge as reading gives—those of them, at least, that are called *canonical*. For we will read the others with greater safety when built up in the belief of the truth, so that they will not take first possession of a weak mind, nor, cheating it with dangerous falsehoods and delusions, fill it with prejudices adverse to a sound understanding. Now, in regard to the canonical Scriptures, he must follow the judgment of the greater number of Catholic Churches; and among these, of course, a high place must be given to such as have been thought worthy to be the seat of an Apostle and to receive epistles. Accordingly, among the canonical Scriptures he will judge according to the following standards: to prefer those that are received by all the Catholic Churches to those which some do not receive. Among those, again, which are not received by all, he will prefer such as have the sanction of the greater number and those of greater authority, to such as are held by the smaller number and those of less authority. If, however, he shall find that some books are held by the greater number of churches, and others by the churches of greater authority (though this is not a very likely thing to happen), I think, that in such a case, the authority on the two sides is to be looked upon as equal. Now the whole Canon of Scripture on which we say this judgment is to be exercised is contained in the following books:—Five books of Moses, that is: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; one book of Joshua the son of Nun; one of Judges; one short book called Ruth, which seems rather to belong to the beginning of Kings; next, four books of Kings and two of Chronicles—these last not following one another, but running parallel, so to speak, and going over the same ground. The books now mentioned are history,

which contains a connected narrative of the times, and follows the order of the events. There are other books which seem to follow no regular order, and are connected neither with the order of the preceding books nor with one another, such as Job, and Tobias, and Esther, and Judith, and the two books of Maccabees and the two of Ezra, which last look more like a sequel to the continuous regular history which terminates with the books of Kings and Chronicles. Next are the Prophets, in which there is one book of the Psalms of David; and three books of Solomon, viz.: Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes. For two books, one called Wisdom and the other Ecclesiasticus, are ascribed to Solomon from a certain resemblance of style, but the most likely opinion is that they were written by Jesus, the son of Sirach. Still they are to be reckoned among the prophetical books, since they have attained recognition as being authoritative. The remainder are the books which are strictly called the Prophets: twelve separate books of the Prophets which are connected with one another, and having never been disjoined, are reckoned as one book; the names of these prophets are as follows:—Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micha, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; then there are the four greater Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel. The authority of the Old Testament is contained within the limits of these forty-four books. That of the New Testament, again, is contained within the following:—Four books of the Gospel, according to Matthew, according to Mark, according to Luke, according to John; fourteen epistles of the Apostle Paul—one to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, one to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, two to the Thessalonians, one to the Colossians, two to Timothy, one to Titus, to Philemon, to the Hebrews; two of Peter, three of John, one of Jude, and one of James; one book of the Acts of the Apostles, and one of the Revelation of John.”

St. Augustine's practical use of the deuterocanonical books may be judged from his *De Civitate Dei* and *Contra Manichaeos* taken as specimens. In the former work, he has fifteen quotations from Wisdom, fourteen from Ecclesi-

asticus, two from Baruch, Judith, and Tobias respectively, and one from the "Benedicite" of Daniel. In his work against the Manicheans he has twenty-three quotations from Wisdom, six from Ecclesiasticus, two from Tobias, one from Baruch and one from the Maccabees. In his work *Contra Faustum* XXXIII. 9, he promulgates the Catholic criterion of the canonical Scriptures: "I admonish briefly you, who hold the execrable error (of the Manicheans), if ye wish to follow the authority of that Scripture which is to be preferred to all others, that ye follow that Scripture which from the time of Christ, through the dispensations of the Apostles, and of the Bishops, who succeeded them in their sees by certain succession, has come down even to our day, preserved throughout the whole earth, approved and explained." Chemnitz, objected against Augustine's authority for the deuterocanonical Scripture, citing a passage from his *Contra Gaudentium*, XXXI. 38: "And indeed the Scripture which is called the Maccabees the Jews have not, as they have the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, to which the Lord bears testimony as to his witnesses saying: 'That all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me' (Luke XXIV. 44); but it (Maccabees) is received by the Church not *unprofitably, if it be soberly read or heard.*" This is a direct testimony that the Church, to whom Augustine directed all who would receive the genuine Scripture, had received and sanctioned a book not contained in the Jewish Canon, and that such book was not without profit to readers and hearers. Later on in the same chapter he explains what he means by the restrictive clause: "if it be soberly read or heard." "For we should not," he says, "assenting approve all things that we read in the Scriptures that men did, even though they be praised by the testimony of God; but we should consider and discern, using the judgment not of our own authority, but of the divine and holy Scriptures, which does not permit us to approve or imitate all the deeds of those to whom it bears a good and excellent testimony." Augustine's words restrict not the authority of Maccabees beneath divine Scripture, but regulate its use.

The same words might have been applied by him to the Gospel of Matthew.

There are sometimes alleged against us the words of Augustine which occur *Lib. Retract. X. 3*: "Thus also I appear not to have rightly called the words prophetic in which it is written: 'Quid superbit terra et cinis?' *Eccli. X. 9*, since they are not written in the book of one whom we certainly know to have been a prophet." We believe that it is not the intention of Augustine here to throw doubt on *Ecclesiasticus*, but to be accurate in drawing a distinction between prophets and hagiographers. Such subtlety leaves intact a book's divinity.

In the first book of his *De Predestinatione Sanctorum XIV.* against the Pelagians, who rejected the book of Wisdom, Augustine argues thus: "These things being so, there should not be rejected a sentence from the book of Wisdom, which has merited to be read by the order of lectors in the Church of Christ for so many years (*tam longa annositate*), and which has merited to be listened to with the veneration of divine authority by all Christians, from bishops to the extreme lay faithful penitents and catechumens." *Iterum ibidem*: "But those who wish to be taught by the works of the Fathers (*Tractatorum*) must needs prefer the book of Wisdom to all the Fathers; for the celebrated Fathers nearest in time to the Apostles preferred it to their own opinions; and they, using it as an authority, believed that they were making use of nothing short of a divine testimony.

"It is evident, that with Augustine, the condition of all the deuterocanonical books was the same; hence by applying this testimony to the entire collection we have not alone the view of Augustine, but a succinct statement of the belief and usage of the Church from the Apostles to his own day.

A document which sets forth the official attitude towards the deuterocanonical Scripture in this age is the Decree of Pope Gelasius, A. D. 492—A. D. 496.*

*This decree is not found the same in the different codices. It is by some ascribed to Damasus (A. D. 366—A. D. 384); by others to Gelasius (A. D. 492—A. D. 496); and by others to Hormisdas (A. D. 514—A. D. 523). Cornely believes that it was originally a decree of Damasus which was afterwards enlarged by Gelasius. All agree that it was an authentic promulgation from the Roman see in that period. [*Hefele Conciliengesch. II. 620.*]

“Nunc vero de Scripturis divinis agendum est quid universalis recipiat Ecclesia, vel quid vitare debeat. Incipit ordo Veteris Testamenti, Genesis liber I. Exodi liber I. Levitici liber I. Numeri liber I. Deuteronomii liber I. Jesu Nave liber I. Judicum liber I. Ruth liber I. Regum libri IV. Paralipomenon libri II. Psalmorum CL. liber I. Salomonis libri III. Proverbia liber I. Ecclesiastes liber I. Cantici Canticorum liber I. Item *Sapientiæ* liber I. *Ecclesiastici* liber I. Item ordo Prophetarum: Esaiæ liber I. Jeremiæ liber I. cum Chinoth, id est, Lamentationibus suis, Ezechielis liber I. Danielis liber I. Osea liber I. Amos liber I. Michaeæ liber I. Joel liber I. Abdiæ liber I. Jonæ liber I. Nahum liber I. Abacuc liber I. Aggæi liber I. Zachariæ liber I. Malachi liber I. Item ordo historiarum: Job liber I. ab aliis omissus. *Tobiæ* liber I. Hesdræ libri II. Hesther liber I. *Judith* liber I. Machabæorum libri II.”

In the year 405, St. Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse (†417) wrote to Pope Innocent I. asking among other things “what books should be received in the Canon of Holy Scripture.” The Pontiff responds: “The subjoined brief will show what books should be received into the Canon of Holy Scripture. These are therefore (the books) concerning which thou hast wished the admonition of a longed for voice. The five books of Moses. . . . The book of Jesus, son of Nave, one book of Judges, the four books of Kings and Ruth, sixteen books of Prophets, *five books of Solomon*, the Psalter; also of historical books, one book of Job, one of *Tobias*, one of Esther, one of *Judith*, *two of Maccabees*, two of Ezra and two of Paralipomenon.” In all these canons Baruch is considered an integral part of Jeremiah. The canons of Gelasius and Innocent *are not ex cathedra definitions*, but plain statements of the belief and usages of the Church from her central authority.

The testimony of the fourth and fifth centuries to the divinity of the deuterocanonical Scriptures is evinced in the four great codices of that period: the Vatican and Sinaitic of the fourth century, and the Alexandrian and Codex of St. Ephrem of the fifth century. An accurate description of these codices will be given in the course of our treatise.

Suffice it to say here that they all make no discrimination between the protocanonical and deuterocanonical books.

The Ethiopian version of Scripture, made in the fourth century, and the Armenian version, made in the beginning of the fifth century, contain all the books canonized by the Council of Trent. At what time the deuterocanonical books were placed in the Syriac translation known as the Peshito is not known, but they were there in the time of St. Ephrem (†379), as we shall see in the course of the present work; hence, we may add the testimony of the Syriac Peshito to the data for the deuterocanonical books.

Sacred archæology also affords proofs for the divinity of the deuterocanonical books. In the Catacombs, we find frequent representations from the deuterocanonical books, proving that those books were a part of the deposit of faith of the Church of the Martyrs. The recent researches in subterranean Rome have clearly demonstrated this proof, as can be seen in the works of Vincenzi (*Sessio IV. Conc. Trid.*); Malou (*Lecture de la Bible II. 144*); Garrucci (*Storia dell' Arte Christiana*), and others. The constant and universal tradition and usage of the first three centuries are corroborated in the fourth and fifth century by the express declarations and praxis of Fathers, by solemn decrees of Councils and Popes, and by the preserved evidences of the practical life of the Church.

The adversaries of the deuterocanonical books bring against us the authority of the Fathers who have edited canons in which the deuterocanonical books find no place. Preeminent for age and authority among these is St. Athanasius, the decus orthodoxiæ.*

We reproduce here the entire quotation from which the opposition of Athanasius is inferred: "Since many have

*St. Athanasius was descended of an illustrious family of Alexandria. He was ordained deacon by St. Alexander, whom in 326 he succeeded in the see of Alexandria. He was the Charles Martel against the Arians in the Council of Nice, and combated this dreadful heresy throughout his life. His long episcopate of more than forty years was a perpetually troubled one. Many times he was forced to fly to the exile of the desert to escape his insidious foes. He is the great patristic authority on the Trinity and the Incarnation.

indeed tried to place in order those books which are called Apocrypha, and mix them with the divinely inspired Scripture which we have received upon certain testimony *as the Fathers handed down to us*, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, it has seemed good to me also, the brethren exhorting, to compute in the Canon, as I have learned, from the beginning, and in order, the books that have been handed down and are believed to be divine, that everyone that has been seduced may convict the seducers, and he who has persevered incorrupt may joyously remember these. The books of the Old Testament are in number *twenty-two*; for so many, as I have heard, are the elements (of speech) with the Hebrews. In this order, and by these names, they are severally enumerated: The first is Genesis, then Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua son of Nun, Judges and Ruth follow; then the four books of Kings, of which the first and second are considered as one, and, in like manner, the third and fourth. Following these the two books of Paralipomenon are also considered as one, as also the first and second of Ezra. Then come the book of Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Canticle of Canticles and Job; then the Prophets, of whom twelve are considered as one book. Then Isaiah, Jeremiah and with him *Baruch*, the Lamentations, and the *Epistle*; then follow Ezechiel and Daniel, thus far the books of the Old Testament."

After enumerating the complete Canon of the New Testament, he continues: "These are the fountains of salvation, so that who thirsts may be filled by their discourses; in these alone, the Christian doctrine is taught. Let no one add to them or take anything from them. But for greater accuracy, I deem it necessary to add this also, *that there are, forsooth, other books besides these, which, indeed, are not placed in the Canon, but which the Fathers decreed should be read to those who have lately come into the fold, and seek to be catechized, and who study to learn the Christian doctrine.* (These are): The Wisdom of Solomon and the Wisdom of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), Esther, Judith, Tobias, the so-called Doctrine of the Apostles, and Pastor. Therefore, while the former are in

the Canon, and these latter are read, *there is no mention of the Apocrypha*, which are the figment of heretics who arbitrarily write books, to which they assign dates, that by the specious semblance of antiquity they may find occasion to deceive the simple." [Ep. Fest. 29.]

To judge rightly St. Athanasius' attitude towards Holy Scripture, we must recall what has been said respecting Meliton. We must readily admit that in these ages a *distinction was made between the two classes of books, but it did not deny divine inspiration to the deuterocanonical works*. A greater dignity was given by some Fathers to the books that had come down to the Church from the Jews; but these same Fathers testify to the veneration in which the deuterocanonical works were held by the Church, and to the part they played in the life of the faithful. It must also be borne in mind that Athanasius flourished in Alexandria the fertile source of Apocrypha, and in his zeal to repel the inventions of heretics he was most conservative in treating the Canon. His location of Esther among the deuterocanonical books is unique, and was probably caused by the sanguinary character of the book, which also led some Jews to doubt of its divine inspiration.

His omission of Maccabees seems to be an oversight since he adverts to their history in his writings. We do not seek to establish that the status of the two classes of books was the same with Athanasius; but we judge it evident from his writings that he venerated these same books as divine, although not equal in extrinsic authority to the books officially handed down from the Jews. The testimony of Athanasius that the Fathers of the Church had decreed that these books should be read in the Church manifests clearly the Church's attitude towards these books; and the following passages taken from the writings of Athanasius show how deeply he also had drunk from these founts.

Sap. XIV. 12.

"Initium enim fornicationis est exquisitio idolorum: et adinventio illorum corruptio vitæ est—."

Athanas. Oratio Contra Gentes, 9.

"—quod et Dei sapientia his verbis declarat: 'Initium fornicationis est exquisitio idolorum.' "

Sap. XIV. 12-21.

"Initium fornicationis," etc.

Ibid.

"Hæc . . . jam olim *Scriptura* his verbis complexa est: 'Initium fornicationis,'" etc. Pergit usque ad Vers. 21.

Sap. XIV. 21.

"Et hæc fuit vitæ humanæ deceptio: quoniam aut affectui, aut regibus deservientes homines, incommunicabile nomen lapidibus et lignis imposuerunt."

Ibid. 17.

"—sed cum incommunicabile, ut loquitur *Scriptura*, Dei nomen et honorem iis qui non dii sed mortales homines fuere ascribere studuerunt—."

Sap. XIII. 5.

"—a magnitudine enim speciei, et creaturæ cognoscibiliter poterit Creator horum videri."

Ibid. 44.

"Ex magnitudine et pulchritudine rerum creatarum convenienter Creator conspicitur."

Sap. VI. 19.

"Cura ergo disciplinæ dilectio est: et dilectio custodia legum illius est: custoditio autem legum consummatio incorruptionis est—."

S. Athanas. De Incarnatione Dei, 4.

"—sicuti Sapiaentia ait: 'Observatio legum confirmatio est incorruptionis.'"

Sap. II. 23, 24.

"Quoniam Deus creavit hominem inexterminabilem, et ad imaginem similitudinis suæ fecit illum. Invidia autem diaboli mors introivit in orbem terrarum—."

Ibid.

"—ut et Sapiaentia his verbis testatur: 'Deus creavit hominem ut incorruptus esset, et imaginem propriæ æternitatis; invidia autem diaboli mors introivit in mundum.'"

Sap. I. 11.

"Custodite ergo vos a mururatione, quæ nihil prodest, et a detractioe parcite linguæ, quoniam sermo obscurus in vacuum non ibit: os autem, quod mentitur, occidit animam."

Ath. Apolog. et Contra Arianos, 3.

"—nec timeant illud quod in Sacris Litteris scriptum est . . . 'Os quod mentitur occidit animam.'"

Tob. XII. 7.

"Sacramentum regis abscondere," etc.

Ibid. 11.

"—cum oporteat, ut scriptum est: 'Sacramentum regis abscondere.' "

This quotation is not made use of by Athanasius, but is found in an apologetic treatise directed to him by a synod held at Alexandria, of the bishops of Egypt, Thebais, Libya and Pentapolis. It is thus the testimony of the East to the divinity of the deuterocanonical works.

In the letter of St. Alexander of Alexandria to his co-laborer we find the following:

Eccli. XXX. 4.

"Mortuus est pater ejus, et quasi non est mortuus: similem enim reliquit sibi post se."

Ibid. 66.

"Mortuus est enim, ait quodam in loco S. Scriptura, pater ejus et quasi non est mortuus."

Baruch III. 12.

"Dereliquisti fontem sapientiæ—."

St. Ath. De Decretis Synod. Nicenæ, 12.

"Verbum item Israellem objurgans ait: 'Dereliquisti fontem sapientiæ.' "

Ibid.

Ibid. 15.

"Hujus porro sapientiæ fontem esse Deum nos docet Baruch, ubi videlicet redarguitur Israel fontem sapientiæ dereliquisse."

Sap. VIII. 25.

"Vapor est enim virtutis Dei," etc.

S. Ath. De Sententia Dionysii, 15.

"—congruenter rursum Christus vapor dictus est: 'Est enim,' inquit, 'vapor virtutis Dei.' "

Eccli. XV. 9.

"Non est speciosa laus in ore peccatoris."

Idem, Epist. ad Episcopos Ægypti et Libyæ, 3.

"Non est speciosa laus in ore peccatoris."

Sap. I. 11.

(Already quoted.)

Idem Apolog. ad Const. Imp. 5.

"Nam os quod mentitur occidit animam."

Tob. IV. 19.

"Consilium semper a sapiente perquire."

Sap. III. 5.

"In paucis vexati, in multis bene disponentur, quoniam Deus tentavit eos, et invenit illos dignos se."

Sap. II. 21.

"Hæc cogitaverunt, et erraverunt: excæcavit enim illos malitia eorum."

Eccl. XIX. 26.

"Ex visu cognoscitur vir, et ab occurso faciei cognoscitur sensatus."

Baruch IV. 20-22.

"Exui me stola pacis, indui autem me sacco obsecrationis, et clamabo ad Altissimum in diebus meis. Ego enim speravi in æternum, salutem vestram et venit mihi gaudium a sancto," etc.

Dan. XIII. 42.

"Exclamavit autem voce magna Susanna, et dixit: Deus æterne, qui absconditorum es cognitor, qui nosti omnia antequam fiant."

Baruch III. 12.

"Dereliquisti fontem sapientiæ—."

Ibid. 17.

"Scriptum est: 'Ab omni sapiente consilium accipe.'"

Idem, Apolog. De Fuga Sua.

19.

"Nam sicut aurum in fornace probatos, ut ait Sapientia, invenit illos Dominus dignos se."

Ibid. 71.

"In his itaque eorum mentem excæcavit malitia."

Idem, Contra Arianos Orat.

I. 4.

"—sapientia ait: 'Ex verbis suis cognoscitur vir.'"

Ibid. 12.

"Susanna quoque aiebat: 'Deus sempiternæ.' Baruch item scripsit: 'Clamabo ad Deum sempiternum in diebus meis.' Et paulo post: 'Ego enim speravi in sempiternum salutem vestram et venit mihi gaudium a sancto.'"

Ibid. 13.

"Et apud Dan.: 'Exclamavit voce magna Susanna et dixit: Deus æterne, qui absconditorum es cognitor, qui nosti omnia antequam fiant.'"

Ibid. 19.

"—item apud Baruch scriptum est: 'Dereliquistis fontem sapientiæ.'"

Eccli. XXIV. 12.

"Tunc præcepit, et dixit mihi Creator omnium: et qui creavit me, requievit in tabernaculo meo.—"

Sap. XIII. 5.

"—a magnitudine enim speciei et creaturæ, cognoscibiliter poterit Creator horum videri."

Judith XIII. 15.

"—non enim quasi homo, sic Deus comminabitur, neque sicut filius hominis ad iracundiam inflammabitur."

Baruch III. 12.

(Oft quoted.)

Sap. IX. 2.

"—et sapientia tua constituisti hominem, ut dominaretur creaturæ, quæ a te facta est—."

Baruch III. 36.

"Hic est Deus noster, et non æstimabitur alius adversus eum."

Sap. VI. 26.

"Multitudo autem sapientum sanitas est orbis terrarum: et rex sapiens stabilimentum populi est."

Eccli. I. 10.

"Et effudit illam super omnia opera sua, et super omnem carnem secundum datum suum et præbuit illam diligentibus se."

Idem Contra Arianos, Orat.

II. 4.

"—vel si ipse de seipso ait: 'Dominus creavit me.' "

Ibid. 32.

"Siquidem ex magnitudine et pulchritudine rerum creatarum, illarum Creator convenienter conspicitur."

Ibid. 35.

" 'Deus autem non ut homo est, quemadmodum *testatur Scriptura.*' "

Ibid. 42.

(Oft quoted.)

Ibid. 45.

"Et in libro Sapientiæ legitur: 'Et sapientia tua constituisti hominem ut dominaretur creaturis quæ a te factæ sunt.' "

Ibid. 49.

"Et Baruch: 'Hic est Deus noster, non æstimabitur alius adversus eum.' "

Ibid. 79.

"Vel si nulla est sapientia, cur multitudo sapientum in Scriptura memoratur?"

Ibid.

"—ut hisce verbis testatur filius Sirach: 'Effudit illam in omnia opera sua cum omni carne, secundum donationem suam, et præbuit illam diligentibus se.' "

Dan. XIV. 4.

"Qui respondens, ait ei: Quia non colo idola manufacta, sed viventem Deum, qui creavit cælum, et terram, et habet potestatem omnis carnis."

Dan. XIII. 45.

"Cumque duceretur ad mortem, suscitavit Dominus spiritum sanctum pueri junioris, cuius nomen Daniel—."

Baruch III. 1.

"Et nunc, Domine omnipotens, Deus Israel, anima in angustiis, et spiritus anxius clamat ad te."

Dan. III. 86.

"Benedicite spiritus, et animæ justorum, Domino; laudate et superexaltate eum in sæcula."

Baruch III. 10, 12.

"Quid est, Israel, quod in terra inimicorum es? Dereliquisti fontem sapientiæ."

Sap. I. 5.

"Spiritus enim sanctus disciplinæ effugiet fictum, et auferet se a cogitationibus, quæ sunt sine intellectu."

Sap. XII. 1.

"O quam bonus et suavis est, Domine, spiritus tuus in omnibus!"

Idem Contra Arianos, Orat. III. 30.

"Item Daniel Astyagi dixit: 'Ego idola manufacta non colo, sed Deum viventem qui cælum et terram creavit, et in omnem carnem dominatum habet.'"

S. Athanas. Epist. I. ad Serapionem, 5.

"Et apud Danielelem: 'Suscitavit Deus Spiritum pueri junioris cuius nomen Daniel, et exclamavit voce magna: Mundus ego sum a sanguine huius.'"

Ibid. 7.

"Baruch item his verbis precatur: 'Anima in angustiis et spiritus anxius clamat ad te,' et in *Hymno trium Puerorum*. 'Benedicite spiritus et animæ justorum Domino.'"

Ibid. 19.

"Et iterum apud Baruch: 'Quid est Israel, quod in terra inimicorum es? dereliquisti fontem sapientiæ.'"

Ibid. 26.

"'Spiritus sanctus,' inquit, 'disciplinæ fugiet dolum, et auferet se a cogitationibus quæ sunt sine intellectu.'"

Ibid. 25.

"—iterum in Sapientia legitur: 'Tuus enim incorruptus spiritus est in omnibus.'"

Dan. III. 57.

"Benedicite omnia opera Domini Domino," etc.

Sap. I. 7.

"Quoniam spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum," etc.

Dan. XIV. 4.

"Qui respondens, ait ei: 'Quia non colo idola manufacta, sed viventem Deum, qui creavit cœlum, et terram et habet potestatem omnis carnis.'"

Eccli. I. 32.

"—exsecratio autem peccatori, cultura Dei."

Dan. XIII. 42.

"Exclamavit autem voce magna Susanna, et dixit: 'Deus æterne, qui absconditorum es cognitor, qui nosti omnia antequam fiant.'"

Baruch III. 36-38.

"Hic est Deus noster, et non æstimabitur alius adversus eum. Hic adinvenit omnem viam disciplinæ, et tradidit illam Jacob puero suo, et Israel dilecto suo. Post hæc in terris visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

Sap. II. 24.

"Invidia autem diaboli mors introivit in orbem terrarum—."

Idem, Epist. II. ad Serap. 6.

"Benedicite omnia opera Domini Domino."

Idem, Epist. III. ad Serap. 4.

"Ita enim scriptum est: Spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum.'"

Idem, Epist. IV. ad Serap. 21.

"Ita quoque Daniel libere Darium affatus est: 'Non veneror idola manufacta, sed viventem Deum qui creavit cœlum et terram, et habet potestatem omnis carnis.'"

S. Ath. Vita S. Antonii, 28.

"—nam 'exsecratio peccatori est pietas erga Deum.'"

Ibid. 31.

"—solusque Deus novit omnia antequam fiant."

St. Athan. De Incarnat. et contra Arianos (In fine).

"—quemadmodum et Jeremias dicit: 'Hic est Deus noster, et non æstimabitur alius adversus eum. Hic adinvenit omnem viam scientiæ, et tradidit illam Jacob puero suo et Israel dilecto suo. Post hæc in terris visus est et cum hominibus conversatus est.'"

St. Athanas. Contra Apollinarium, Lib. I. 7.

"Invidia autem diaboli mors intravit in mundum."

Ibid. 15.

Repetit idem.

Dan. III. 57-62; 88.

Baruch III. 12.

(Already quoted.)

Baruch III. 12, 13.

"Derelinquisti fontem sapientiae; nam si in via Dei ambulasses, habitasses utique in pace sempiterna."

Sap. V. 3.

"—dicentes intra se, poenitentiam agentes, et præ angustia spiritus gementes: Hi sunt quos habuimus aliquando in derisum, et in similitudinem impropertii."

Eccli. XXXVIII. 9.

"Fili, in tua infirmitate ne despicias te ipsum, sed ora Dominum, et ipse curabit te."

Eccli. XV. 9.

(Already quoted.)

Dan. III. 50.

(Already quoted.)

St. Ath. De Trinitate et S. Spiritu, 2.

"Tres quoque sancti martyres, Ananias, Azarias, et Misael, in fornace ignis positi in terra Chaldæorum, cum admirabiliter Deus calorem ignis ad temperatum refrigerium convertisset, universam creaturam adhortantes secum laudare Deum sic incipiunt: 'Benedicite,' " etc. Citat majorem partem Cantici Trium Puerorum.

Ibid. 19.

(Already quoted.)

Ibid. 20.

—"dicit: 'Derelinquisti fontem sapientiae; viam Domini si fuisses ingressus, utique habitares in pace in æternum tempus.'"

St. Ath. Sermo Major De Fide, 28.

"Hic est quem habuimus aliquando in derisionem—."

St. Ath. Fragment De Amuletis.

"—coelesti sapientiae obsequens dicenti: 'Fili, in tempore infirmitatis tuæ ne despicias, sed ora Dominum, et ipse curabit te.'"

Idem, Epist. VII. 4.

(Already quoted.)

Idem, Epist. X. 3.

(Already quoted.)

Sap. VII. 27.

"Et cum sit una, omnia potest: et in se permanens omnia innovat, et per nationes in animas sanctas se transfert, amicos Dei et prophetas constituit."

Sap. II. 12.

"Circumveniamus ergo justum, quoniam inutilis est nobis," etc.

Eccli. XXVII. 29.

"Et qui foveam fodit, incidet in eam," etc.

Sap. II. 12.

(Already quoted.)

Dan. XII.

Eccli. XV. 9.

(Already quoted.)

Baruch II. 35.

"Et statuam illis testamentum alterum sempiternum, ut sim illis in Deum, et ipsi erunt mihi in populum," etc.

Eccli. II. 1.

"Fili, accedens ad servitutum Dei, sta in justitia, et timore, et præpara animam tuam ad tentationem."

Ibid. 4.

"—prout de Sapientia testatur Salomon 'quæ cum una sit, omnia potest, et in se manens omnia renovat, et cum ad sanctas animas accedet, tunc Dei amatores et prophetas efficit.'"

Idem. Epist. XI. 5.

"Circumveniamus justum, quia nobis minime placet."

Ibidem.

"Qui foveam proximo suo fodit in eandem incidet."

Idem, Epist. XIX.

(Already quoted.)

Idem, Epist. ad Marcellinum, 9.

"Spiritu edoctus quisque sermonem administrat ita ut . . . aliquando historias præscribant ut Daniel Susannæ—."

Ibid. 29.

(Already quoted.)

S. Ath. Expositio in Ps. LXXVII. 10.

"Novam Evangelii traditionem dicit atque illud: 'Ecce dies venit, et disponam cum eis testamentum novum.'"

Idem, in Ps. CXVII.

"—juxta illud: 'Accedis ad serviendum Domino, præpara animam tuam ad tentationem.'"

- Eccli. XVIII. 6.
 "Cum consummaverit homo,
 tunc incipiet," etc.
- Baruch III. 38.
 "Post hæc in terris visus est,
 et cum hominibus conversatus
 est."
- Dan. XIII. 20.
 "Ecce, ostia pomarii clausa
 sunt, et nemo nos videt et nos in
 concupiscentia tui sumus," etc.
- Eccli. XXIII. 22.
 "Anima calida quasi ignis
 ardens non extinguetur, donec
 aliquid glutiat."
- Dan. XIII.
 "Ecce, ostia pomarii clausa
 sunt, et nemo nos videt et nos in
 concupiscentia tui sumus," etc.
- Eccli. VI. 36.
 "Et si videris sensatum, evi-
 gila ad eum, et gradus ostiorum
 illius exterat pes tuus."
- Eccli. XLIII. 7.
 "A luna signum diei festi,"
 etc.
- Idem, Ps. CXVIII. 60.
 Repetit idem.
- Ibidem 96.
 —"juxta illud: 'Cum con-
 summatum homo, tunc incipit.'"
- St. Ath. De Titulis Psalm-
 orum, De Ps. LXXVII.
 137.
 "Et in terra visus est, et cum
 hominibus conversatus est."
 (Repetit idem in Ps. XCIII.)
- St. Athan, Fragmenta in
 Math.
 "Eodem quoque modo senes
 duo cum Susannæ dixissent:
 'Ecce in concupiscentia tui su-
 mus—.'"
- Ibid.
 "—juxta Sapientiæ verbum:
 'Anima calida est ut ignis ac-
 census.'"
- Ibid.
 "Daniel vero lascivos senes
 sycophantiæ causa a se damna-
 tos juxta legem Moysis ultus
 est."
- Ibid. De Falsis Prophetis.
 "Si videris sapientem ali-
 quem, ex consilio Sapientiæ,
 mane vigila ad illum, stationes
 portarum ejus terat pes tuus,
 ut ab eo ediscas legis umbras et
 gratiarum dona."
- Ibid. De Lunaticis.
 "—Sapientia ita loquente:
 'A luna, signum diei festi.'"

Maccab. Passim.

Expositio in Ps. LXXVIII.
*"Carneſ ſanctorum tuorum
 beſtiis terræ. Quomodo enim
 ſancti non fuerunt quorum ſan-
 guis effuſus eſt pro legis obſer-
 vantia, ex quorum erant nu-
 mero Maccabæi?"*

No man can ſay that St. Athanaſius ſimply conſidered theſe books as pious productions, ſomewhat like to our Imitation of Chriſt. Quoting a text from Judith, as we have ſeen above, Contra Arianos II. 38, he explicitly adds "*ut teſtatur Scriptura.*"

His insertion of *Pastor* and the *Doctrina Apostolorum* among the books of the ſecond canon is a critical error of his own, and not warranted by the uſage of the Church. Canon-icity and divinity were not in the mind of Athanaſius convertible terms. There had been no official promulgation of a canon, and hence he applied the term to the liſt of books which of old had received the ſanction of the Synagogue. We feel warranted, then, in ſaying that as a witneſs of tradition in his practical uſe of Scripture the weight of Athanaſius' authority is with us, while, in his capacity of critic, he accords to the deuterocanonical books in general a veneration which the Church never gave to any but divine books.

We omit the *Synopsis Scripturæ*, formerly falſely aſcribed to Athanaſius, ſince it covers the ſame ground as the teſtimony already quoted.

Another Father whoſe authority is invoked againſt us is St. Cyril of Jeruſalem.*

*St. Cyril of Jeruſalem was born about the year 315 A. D. He was ordained deacon by St. Macarius of Jeruſalem and prieſt by St. Maximus, whom he ſucceeded in the ſee of Jeruſalem in the year 350 A. D. His epiſcopate was troubled by the oppoſition of the Arians, then powerful in the Eaſt. He was often exiled by the intrigues of theſe, and was marked for death by Julian the Apoſtate; but the death of Julian prevented the execution of his project. Cyril died in his ſee in 386. In one of his letters to Conſtans he teſtifies of a marvelous luminous apparition of a croſs which extended from Mt. Calvary to Mt. Olivet which was witneſſed by many for ſeveral hours. His chief works are his Catecheſes to the Catechumens and Neophytes. Although ſome of Cyril's opinions are ſtrange, he was a ſtaunch defender of the faith, and he merits to be conſidered a coryphæus in patriſtic theology.

The testimony upon which his authority is invoked against us is found in his fourth *Catechesis*, Chapters 33, 35, and 36. The following excerpts will illustrate his position:

"Studiously also learn *from the Church* what are the books of the Old Testament, and what of the New. Read to me nothing of the Apocrypha. For thou, who art ignorant of those books which are recognized and received by all, why dost thou wretchedly lose thy labor about those which are doubtful and controverted? Read the *divine* Scriptures, the *twenty-two* books of the Old Testament, which the seventy-two interpreters translated . . . Read these *twenty-two books*, and have naught to do with the Apocrypha. These alone studiously meditate and handle, which we also read in the Church with certain confidence. Much more prudent and more pious were the Apostles and the ancient bishops, the rectors of the Church, who handed them down. Thou, therefore, being a child of the Church, overstep not the established laws." Continuing, he gives the same canon as that of Athanasius, except that he conjoins Ruth with Judges, and includes Esther, thus preserving the number twenty-two. And he adds: "But let all the other (books) he held outside (the canon) in a second (inferior order). And whatever are not read in the churches, do thou not read these even privately."

In truthfully weighing this testimony, we find in the first sentence the adoption of our criterion of inspiration: "*Studiously also learn from the Church what are the books of the Old Testament, and what of the New.*" In the enunciation of this eternal verity, Cyril spoke in the name of the whole Church. It was always believed, and always will be believed by those of the faith of Christ, that it was the province of the Church to regulate the code of Scripture. This every Father believed and taught. Neither does Cyril characterize as apocryphal the deuterocanonical books. He considered them doubtful and of an inferior rank, and hence, exhorts the catechumens to make use of those concerning which there was no doubt. In forbidding the converts to read privately the books which were not read in the Church, he tacitly allows such private reading of the deuterocanonical books.

The spirit of the Church at Jerusalem was extremely conservative, tinged with Judaism. Naturally for such the books which the Synagogue did not recognize would be regarded with some disfavor. Cyril was influenced by the trend of religious thought reigning at Jerusalem. He sacrificed nothing by his strict views on the canon. The protocanonical books are the most useful; the Church had not defined the Canon; and Cyril safeguarded the rights of the Church by bidding everyone go to her for the Canon. The protocanonical and deuterocanonical books were not made absolutely equal until the decree of the Council of Trent. The Fathers considered the latter as useful, edifying, and most of the Fathers considered them of divine origin, but they, in general, accorded them a less dignity and veneration than that given the protocanonical books. The slight doubt that reigned in some churches regarding their divine origin induced Cyril to place them in an inferior rank. In the uncertainty of religious thought of his time, he judged it better that the neophytes should devote their study to the absolutely certain sources of divine truth. Were Cyril alive to-day, he would *learn from the Church to receive the complete Canon.*

In his practical use of Scripture, Cyril follows the usage of the Church, and often quotes the deuterocanonical books, as the following examples will show:

Dan. III. 27, 29.

"—quia justus es in omnibus quæ fecisti nobis, et universa opera tua vera, et viæ tuæ rectæ, et omnia judicia tua vera. Peccavimus, et inique egimus," etc.

Catech. II. XVI.

"—illicque pro malorum remedio dicebant: 'Justus es, Domine, in omnibus quæ fecisti nobis: peccavimus enim et inique egimus.' "

Eccli. III. 22.

"Altiora te ne quæsieris, et fortiora te ne scrutatus fueris: sed quæ præcepit tibi Deus, illa cogita semper, et in pluribus operibus ejus ne fueris curiosus."

Catech. VI. 4.

"Profundiora te ne quæsieris, et fortiora te ne investigates: quæ tibi præcepta sunt, ea mente agita."

Sap. XIII. 2.

"—sed aut ignem, aut spiritum, aut citatum aërem, aut gyrum stellarum, aut nimiam aquam, aut solem et lunam, rectores orbis terrarum deos putaverunt."

Sap. XIII. 5.

"—a magnitudine enim speciei et creaturæ, cognoscibiliter poterit creator horum videri."

Eccli. XLIII. 2.

"Sol in aspectu annuntians in exitu, vas admirabile opus excelsi."

Sap. XIII. 5.

"—magnitudine enim speciei et creaturæ, cognoscibiliter poterit Creator horum videri."

Baruch III. 36–38.

"Hic est Deus noster, et non aestimabitur alius adversus eum. Hic adinvenit omnem viam disciplinæ, et tradidit illam Jacob puero suo, et Israel dilecto suo. Post hæc in terris visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

Ibid. 8.

"Deum nonnulli ignem esse senserunt."

Catech. IX. 2.

"juxta Salomonem qui ait: 'nam ex magnitudine et pulchritudine creaturarum, proportionem servata, Procreator earum conspicitur.'"

Ibid. 6.

"—nonne admirari oportet eum qui in solis fabricam inspexerit? nam modici vasis apparens vim ingentem complectitur; ab oriente apparens et in occidentem usque lumen emittens."

Ibid. 16.

"—et ex his quæ dicta lectaque sunt, quæque ipse reperire aut cogitare poteris, ex magnitudine et pulchritudine creaturarum, proportionem servata, Auctorem earum conspicias."

Catech. XI. 15.

"—audi Prophetam dicentem: 'Hic est Deus noster, non reputabitur alius adversus eum. Invenit omnem viam scientiæ, et dedit eam Jacob puero suo, et Israel dilecto a se. Post hæc in terra visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est.'"

Eccli. II. 22.

(Already quoted.)

Sap. II. 24.

"Invidia autem diaboli mors introivit in orbem terrarum—."

Eccli. IV. 36.

"Non sit porrecta manus tua ad accipiendum, et ad dandum collecta."

Dan. XIV. 35.

"Et apprehendit eum Angelus Domini in vertice ejus, et portavit eum capillo capitis sui."

Sap. VI. 17.

"Quoniam dignos se ipsa circumquærens, et in viis ostendit se illis hilariter, et in omni providentia occurrit illis."

Dan. XIII. 42-45.

"Exclamavit autem voce magna Susanna, et dixit: Deus æterne, qui absconditorum es cognitor, qui nosti omnia, antequam fiant, tu scis, quoniam falsum testimonium tulerunt contra me, et ecce, morior, cum nihil horum fecerim, quæ isti malitiose composuerunt adversum me. Exaudivit autem Dominus vocem ejus. Cumque duceretur ad mortem, suscitavit Dominus spiritum sanctum pueri junioris, cujus nomen Daniel-- "

Ibid. 19.

"Ne extollas te ipsum, ne cadas. Quæ tibi mandata sunt ea sola meditare."

Catech. XII. 5.

"At maximum hoc opificio- rum Dei in paradiso choros agens *inde diaboli ejecit invidia*."

Catech. XIII. 8.

"Nec enim ad accipiendum tantum porrecta, verum etiam ad operandum prompta tibi sit manus."

Catech. XIV. 25.

"Si enim Habacuc ab angelo translatus est, per comam sui capitis portatus," etc.

Catech. XVI. 19.

"—tantum illi ostia aperiamus; *circumit* enim *quærens dignos*."

Ibid. 31.

"Idem (Spiritus Sanctus) sapientem effecit Danielis animam ut seniorum judex esset adolescens. Damната fuerat casta Susanna tamquam impudica; vindex nullus; quis enim eam a principibus eripuisset? Ad mortem ducebatur, in manibus lictorum jam erat. . . *scriptum est enim*: 'Suscitavit Deus Spiritum sanctum in puero juvenculo.' "

Eccli. XXXIV. 9.

Catech. XXIII. Mystagogia, V. 17.

"Qui non est tentatus, quid scit?"

"—et quomodo alicubi dictum est: 'Vir non tentatus, non est probatus.' "

We must admit that Cyril's use of deuterocanonical Scripture is more restricted than that of other writers, but it is sufficient to show how the general belief and usage of the Church overcame the critical views of the individual. The force of such general acceptance of the Church may easily be judged from this alone, that in the very catecheses in which he recommends to the catechumens the use of only the protocanonical books, he himself employs the deuterocanonical books as divine Scripture.

There is also alleged against us the authority of Epiphanius.*

The passage upon which his opposition to the deuterocanonical works is founded, occurs in the fourth chapter of the treatise on Weights and Measures. In this chapter he endeavors to make the number of canonical books of the Old Testament accord with the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet. Of course, he only enumerates the books of the Jewish Canon. The closing words of the chapter are:

*St. Epiphanius was born in Palestine, about the year 310 A. D. His youth was spent in the life of a solitary in the desert. He founded at the age of twenty a monastery in the desert, and devoted himself to the study of sacred and profane writers. The result of his continued application to reading is apparent in his works. In 366 he was made Bishop of Salamina the metropolis of Cyprus. In the capacity of bishop, he was a sturdy bulwark against the teeming heresies of that age. He bitterly opposed the theories of Origen, and, in his zeal to anathematize him, was discourteous to John Chrysostom. His imprudent zeal often led him to encroach on the jurisdiction of other bishops. He died on a return voyage by sea from Constantinople to Cyprus in 403. The works of Epiphanius exhibit a vast erudition, marred by a lack of criticism and by the insertion of many fables. He was a compiler more than an original thinker. His style is harsh, negligent, obscure and often without logical sequence. He lacked the power and discerning mind to master and order the vast amount that he had read. His chief works are his *Panarium* or *Treatise against the Heresies*, the *Anchorage*, the *Treatise of the Weights and Measures of the Jews*, and a treatise concerning the twelve precious stones of the rational of the High Priest of the Jews.

"Regarding the two books that are written in verse, that is, the Wisdom of Solomon, which is called Panaretus, and the book of Jesus the Son of Sirach, the grandson of Jesus, who wrote this book of Wisdom in Hebrew, which his grandson Jesus translated into Greek, although they are useful and profitable, they are by no means placed in the *Canon of Scripture*. Hence, they were not placed in the Ark of the testament." The obscurity and lack of critical acumen of the writer appear in this short extract. It is evident that he supposes that the divine books of the Jews were placed in the Ark of the covenant, whereas only the Decalogue was therein placed. The term canonical with Epiphanius, signified the official approbation by the Synagogue. Being a native of Palestine, his mind was in a measure tinged by Judaizing theories. In his day, the deuterocanonical books were not officially canonized by any universal authority. They had the sanction of usage and the veneration of the Church, but this did not make them equal in extrinsic authority to the books that Jew and Christian had always considered divine. Although Epiphanius speaks only of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus his words equally apply to the other deuterocanonical books, since their history has always been the same. The reason that Tobias, Judith and Maccabees receive no recognition from Cyril and Epiphanius is most probably that they are not so useful to impart dogmatic truths. Cornely and others think that Epiphanius, in giving in this place the restricted Jewish Canon, tacitly infers the existence of an enlarged Christian Canon. We fail to find this opinion credible. Everything seems to demonstrate that the canonization spoken of in those days was simply the official sanction of the Synagogue. This was the one and only Canon that these Fathers recognized, but in excluding the other books from it they did not deny them divinity, although many accorded them an inferior dignity. All the books were read; all were venerated by the faithful; but the books of the first Canon had the external sanction of the Synagogue, which raised them theoretically above the others. It was only in the Council of Trent, that the official declaration of the Church made the two classes perfectly

equal. Now, such official declaration being wanting, it is not strange that these Fathers, theoretically treating the question should not place these books in the Canon. Neither is it strange that individuals should have doubted concerning the divinity of these books. It shows the need of the Magisterium of the Church, which entered at the appropriate time, and took away all doubt by her authoritative voice.

That Epiphanius, at least, considered Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus as divine Scripture appears from the following passage from *Adversus Hæreses*, Hæres. LXXVI. 5: "For if thou wert begotten of the Holy Ghost, and taught by the Apostles and Prophets, this shouldst thou do: Examine all the sacred codices from Genesis to the times of Esther, which are *twenty-seven* books of the Old Testament, and are enumerated as twenty-two; then the four Holy Gospels. . . the *Books of Wisdom, that of Solomon, and of the Son of Sirach*, and in fine *all the books of Scripture*." Hence, Epiphanius, as it were, made two classes of the Old Testament Scriptures; the books canonized by the Jews, and those adopted and used by the Church as Holy Writ. In favor of the former was the authority of the Synagogue; while all used and venerated the latter, as, individuals, they did not feel warranted in according them a prerogative that the Church had not yet given.

Epiphanius' use of the deuterocanonical books will appear from the following passages:

Eccli. VII. 1.

"Noli facere mala, et non te apprehendent."

Sap. III. 14.

"—et spado, qui non operatus est per manus suas iniquitatem," etc.

Adversus Hæreses, Lib. I.
Hæres. XXIV. 6.

"--quemadmodum *Scriptura* testatur: 'Qui quærunt mala, mala eos apprehendent.' "

Ibid. Hæres. XXVI. 15.

"Ad hæc alio in loco Spiritus Sanctus . . . hoc modo vaticinatus est: 'Beata sterilis incoinquinata, quæ nescivit torum in delicto, et spado, qui non operatus est manibus suis iniquitatem.' "

Maccab. I. 1

Dan. XIII. 42.

"Exclamavit autem voce magna Susanna, et dixit: Deus æterne, qui absconditorum es cognitor, qui nosti omnia antequam fiant—."

Eccli. XIII. 20.

"Omnis caro ad similem sibi conjungetur, et omnis homo simili sui sociabitur."

Eccli. XLIII. 26.

"Qui navigant mare, enarrant pericula ejus; et audientes auribus nostris admirabimur."

Eccli. XIV. 5.

"Qui sibi nequam est, cui alii bonus erit?"

Sap. VII. 2.

"Decem mensium tempore coagulatus sum in sanguine," etc.

Baruch III. 36-38.

"Hic est Deus noster, et non æstimabitur alius adversus eum. Hic adinvenit omnem viam disciplinæ et tradidit illam Jacob puero suo et Israel dilecto suo.

Ibid. Hæres. XXX. 25.

"Quæ causa est cur in Maccabæorum libris scriptum sit: '—e Cittiensium terra genus quodam esse propagatum.'"

Ibid. 31.

"Novit enim omnia Deus antequam fiant, *'ut est Scriptum.'*"

Ibid. Hæres. XXXII. 8.

"Quoniam avis omnis secundum genus suum congregatur, et omnis homo simili sui sociabitur *'ait Scriptura.'*"

Ibid. Hæres. XLII. 9.

"— ut hæc in nobis vera sit Scripturæ sententia: 'Qui navigant mare, virtutes Domini narrant.'"

Ibid. Hæres. XLII. Refut.

70.

"Quis seipsum in præceptis impellit, impletque quod scriptum est: 'Qui sibi nequam est, cui bonus erit?'"

Ibid. Lib. II. Hæres. II. 29.

"In quo ad Salomonis dictum illud alluisse videntur: 'Decem mensium spatio concretus in sanguine.'"

Ibid. Hæres. LVII. 2.

"— ut Scriptura declarat: 'Hic est Deus tuus: non reputabitur alius ad ipsum. Invenit omnem viam scientiæ et dedit illam Jacob puero suo, et Israel

Post hæc in terris visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

Baruch III. 36.

(Already quoted.)

Eccli. XX. 2.

"Concupiscentia spadonis devirginabit juvenculam—."

Eccli. XXVII 2.

"Sicut in medio compaginis lapidum palus figitur sic et inter medium venditionis et emptionis angustiaabitur peccatum."

Sap. I. 13.

"Quoniam Deus mortem non fecit, nec lætatur in perditione vivorum."

Sap. I. 14.

"Creavit enim, ut essent omnia: et sanabiles fecit nationes orbis terrarum: et non est in illis medicamentum exterminii, nec inferorum regnum in terra."

Sap. II. 23.

"Quoniam Deus creavit hominem inexterminabilem, et ad imaginem similitudinis suæ fecit illum."

dilecto suo. Post hæc in terra visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est.' "

Ibid. 9.

"Scriptum est, inquit: 'Iste Deus est noster, et non æstimabitur alius.' "

Ibid. Hæres. LVIII. 4.

"—a Sapiente dicitur: 'Concupiscentia spadonis devirginabit juvenculam.' "

Ibid. Hæres. LIX. 7.

"Atque 'ut palus,' inquit, inter duos lapides conteritur, sic peccatum in medio ejus qui emit et vendit.' "

Ibid. Hæres. LXIV. 19.

"Deus enim mortem non fecit, nec delectatur in perditione viventium. Invidia vero diaboli mors introivit in mundum, ut per *Salomonem Sapientia testatur*."

Ibid. Hæres. LXIV. 31.

"—id quod Sapientia confirmat his verbis: 'Creavit enim ut essent omnia Deus; et salutare sunt mundi generationes. Nec est in illis medicamentum exitii.' "

Ibid. 34.

"Creavit enim, ait Sapientia, hominem in incorruptione; ad imaginem æternitatis suæ fecit illum."

Sap. III. 1-4.

"Justorum autem animæ in manu Dei sunt, et non tanget illos tormentum mortis. Visi sunt oculis insipientium mori: et æstimata est afflictio exitus illorum: et quod a nobis est iter, exterminium: illi autem sunt in pace. Et si coram hominibus tormenta passi sunt, spes illorum immortalitate plena est."

Sap. VII. 2.

"—decem mensium tempore coagulatus sum in sanguine, ex semine hominis, et delectamento somni conveniente."

Eccli. X. 13.

"Cum enim morietur homo, hæreditabit serpentes, et bestias, et vermes."

Sap. III. 4-6.

"Et si coram hominibus tormenta passi sunt, spes illorum immortalitate plena est. In paucis vexati, in multis bene disponentur: quoniam Deus tentavit eos, et invenit illos dignos se. Tamquam aurum in fornace probavit illos, et quasi holocausti hostiam accepit illos, et in tempore erit respectus illorum."

Ibid. 36.

"Idem vero per Salomonem in eo libro qui Sapiencia inscribitur ostendit ubi: 'Justorum,' inquit, 'animæ in manu Dei sunt, et non tanget illos tormentum. Visi sunt oculis insipientium mori, et æstimata est afflictio exitus illorum, et quod a nobis est iter, exterminium. Illi autem sunt in pace, et spes illorum immortalitate plena est.' "

Ibid. 39.

"—Christi corpus non ex voluntate viri, ac voluptate somnique congressione in iniquitatibus esse susceptum."

Ibid.

"Quam ob causam sapiens ille Sirach ita pronuntiat: 'Cum enim morietur homo, hæreditabit serpentes, et bestias, et vermes.' "

Ibid. 48.

"Quam vero consentanea iis de martyribus a Salomone pronuntiata sint, attendite. Neque enim *aliarum Scripturarum testimonio* caremus. 'Deus,' inquit, 'tentavit eos, et invenit eos dignos se. Tamquam aurum in fornace probavit illos; et sicut holocaustum suavitatis accepit illos; et in tempore visitationis illorum,' etc. Cum antea dixisset: 'Et si coram hominibus tormenta passi sunt, spes illorum immortalitate plena est. In paucis correpti magna beneficia consequentur.' "

Sap. I. 4.

"—quoniam in malevolam animam non introibit sapientia, nec habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis."

Sap. IV. 12.

"Fascinatio enim nugacitatis obscurat bona, et inconstantia concupiscentiæ transvertit sensum sine malitia."

Sap. IV. 8-12.

"Senectus enim venerabilis est non diuturna etc."

Sap. IV. 13, 14.

"Consummatus in brevi, explevit tempora multa, placita enim erat Deo anima illius: propter hoc properavit educere illum de medio iniquitatum; populi autem videntes, et non intelligentes, nec ponentes in præcordiis talia.—"

Baruch III. 36.

"Hic est Deus noster, et non æstimabitur alius adversus eum."

Ibid. 37.

"Hic adinvenit omnem viam disciplinæ, et tradidit illam Jacob puero suo, et Israel dilecto suo."

Ibid. 38.

"Post hæc in terris visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

Ibid. 54.

"Præterea Salomon: 'In malevolam,' inquit, 'animam non introibit sapientia, nec habitabit in corpore obnoxio peccato.'"

Ibid. Hæres. LXV. 1.

"Nam in illo *Scripturæ dictum* illud impletur: 'Fascinatio enim nugacitatis obscurat bona, et inconstantia concupiscentiæ transvertit mentem sine malitia.'"

Ibid. Hæres. LXVII. 4.

"Hic igitur: 'Senectus,' inquit, 'venerabilis non longæva,' " etc.

Ibid.

"Ut autem de pueris loqui illum appareat statim adjicit: 'Consummatus in brevi (quasi dicat: mortuus juvenis) implevit tempora multa. Placita enim erat Domino anima illius: propterea festinavit eum educere de medio malitiæ.'"

Ibid. Hæres. LXIX. 31.

"Alter cum ipso minime comparabitur."

Ibid.

"Quid porro? Ut de Filio sermonem esse cognoscas, deinceps ista subiecit: 'Invenit omnem viam scientiæ et dedit illam.'"

Ibid.

"Tum postea: 'In terra visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est.'"

Ibid. 37, 38.

Ibid. 38.

Esther XIII. 9.

“—et dixit: Domine, Domine, rex omnipotens, in ditione enim tua cuncta sunt posita, et non est, qui possit tuæ resistere voluntati, si decreveris salvare Israel.”

Baruch III. 37, 38.

Sap. I. 7.

“Quoniam spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum: et hoc, quod continet omnia, scientiam habet vocis.”

Eccli. XIV. 5.

“Qui sibi nequam est, cui alii bonus erit? et non jucundabitur in bonis suis.”

Sap. IX. 14.

“Cogitationes enim mortaliū timidæ, et incertæ providentiæ nostræ—.”

Ibid. 53.

Ibid. 55.

Ibid. Lib. III. Hæres. LXX.

7.

“Sed et illud proinde certum, posse illum quæ velit efficere: ‘Nullus est enim qui ejus voluntati resistat.’ ”

Ibid. Hæres. LXXI. 3.

“Qui invenit omnem viam scientiæ. Exstitisse vero divina Scriptura non dubitat. Nam quæ sequuntur ante illum exstitisse declarant. Velut quod omnem viam scientiæ reperisse dicatur, deinde in terris visus esse.”

Ibid. Hæres. LXXIV.

“Spiritus enim Domini replevit orbem terrarum.”

Ibid. Hæres. LXXVI. Confut. VIII.

“Ecquis igitur illius miserebitur, qui sibi ipsi malus, nemini alteri bonus est?”

Ibid. LXXVI. Confut. XXXI.

“—siquidem divina majestas, Patris inquam et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, angelorum mentes omnes longo intervallo superat, nedum *hominum quorum timidæ cogitationes.*”

Baruch, III. 38.

"Post hæc in terris visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

St. Epiph. Expositio Fidei XVI.

"— ac denique verus ut appareret Filius, et illud *Propheta vaticinium expleret*: 'Et post hæc enim in terra visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est.' "

The frequency with which this passage is quoted by the Fathers manifests that they considered it a *classic text to prove the Incarnation*.

Sap. XIV. 20.

"Initium enim fornicationis est exquisitio idolorum—."

St. Epiph. Ancoratus II.

" 'Initium quippe fornicationis est exquisitio idolorum,' *ut ait Scriptura*."

Eccli. III. 22.

"Altiora te ne quæsieris, et fortiora te ne scrutatus fueris: sed quæ præcepit tibi Deus, illa cogita semper, et in pluribus operibus ejus ne fueris curiosus."

Ibid. XII.

"Etenim cum nos *Scriptura* reprehendit his verbis: 'Quæ præcepta tibi sunt, hæc cogita; neque arcanis et occultis tibi opus est: et altiora te ne quæsieris, ac profundiora te ne inquiras.' "

Dan. III. 57.

"Benedicite omnia opera Domini Domino—."

Ibid. XXIV.

"—et creaturas a Creatore discernentes, hunc in modum (tres pueri in fornace) locuti sunt: 'Benedicite omnia opera Domini Domino.' "

He repeats this passage and other portions of the Canticle in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth Chapters.

Sap X. 21

"—quoniam sapientia aperuit os mutorum, et linguas infantium fecit disertas."

Ibid. XXXI.

"—quique balbutientium linguam disertam præstitit," etc.

Sap. VIII. 2

"Hanc amavi, et exquisivi a juventute mea, et quæsivi spon-

Ibid. XLII.

"Ad hæc Salomon aliam quamdam sapientiam appellat:

sam mihi eam assumere, et amator factus sum formæ illius."

Baruch III. 38.

"Post hæc in terris visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

Esther XIII. 9.

(Already quoted.)

Sap. II. 23.

"Quoniam Deus creavit hominem inexterminabilem, et ad imaginem similitudinis suæ fecit illum."

'Amavi,' inquit, 'pulchritudinem ejus et eam mihi sponsam duxi.'"

Ibid. LXXVIII.

"Christus autem Deus e cœlo, verbum e Maria caro factum est hominemque suscepit, et nobiscum, ut ait Scriptura, versatus est."

Ibid. XCVI.

(Already quoted.)

St. Epiph. Epist. ad Joan. Episcopum Hieros. Cap. VI.

"Dicit enim (Salomon) in Sapientia quæ titulo ejus inscribitur: 'Creavit Deus incorruptum hominem, et imaginem suæ proprietatis dedit ei.'"

Here, in the clearest terms, Epiphanius makes known that his exclusion of a book from the list of those called canonical, was not equivalent to denying it the authority of divine Scripture. He certainly believed that he was quoting the revealed word, when he introduces these passages in the solemn formulæ, "ut ait Scriptura," "Scriptum est," etc. Neither did he quote these passages at random, not advertising to the fact that they were not in the Canon. He often *specifies the book, and speaks of the authors*. We believe that had the other deuterocanonical books been equally serviceable for dogmatic argument, he would have drawn also from them as from Scriptural sources. At least, our adversaries must admit that Epiphanius is a staunch supporter of the divinity of at least three deuterocanonical books, and also of the deuterocanonical fragments of Daniel, and that his exclusion of the deuterocanonical books from the list then termed canonical, cannot be construed to signify non-inspiration of the same.

Among the adversaries of the deuterocanonical books is placed Gregory Nazianzenus.*

Two passages in Gregory's works form the basis of his pretended opposition to the deuterocanonical books. The first passage occurs in *Carmen I.* 13:

"Accipe a me selectum hunc, amice, numerum,
Sunt quidem historici libri omnes duodecim,
Antiquioris Hebraicæ sapientiæ:
Primus Genesis, deinde Exodus et Leviticus;
Postea Numeri, tum Deuteronomium,
Deinde Josue et Judices: Ruth octavus est.
Nonus decimusque liber, res gestæ Regum,
Et Paralipomena; Esdram habes ultimo loco.
Quinque versibus scripti sunt, quorum primus Job,
Postea David, tum Salomonis tres,
Ecclesiastes, Canticum, et Proverbia.
Similiter quinque Spiritus prophetici;
Ac uno quidem continentur libri duodecim:
Osee, et Amos, et Micheas tertius;
Deinde Joel, postea Jonas, Abdias,
Nahum, Habacuc et Sophonias,
Aggæus, deinde Zacharias, Malachias,
Uno hi continentur libro: secundo Isaïas,
Tertio qui vocatus est Jeremias ab infantia,
Quarto Ezechiel, quinto Danielis gratia.
Veteres quidem numeravi duos et viginti libros
Hebræorum elementorum numero respondentens."

*Gregory Nazianzenus, takes his distinctive title from Nazianzus, a small town in the south-west of Cappadocia, which is not known to the early geographers, and owes its chief importance to its connection with our author. It is impossible to fix with exactness the date of his birth; according to the Bollandists it should be placed before the year 300. His father, at first an infidel, was converted by his wife Nonna, and afterwards was Bishop of Nazianzus; his mother St. Nonna, considered the infant Gregory as given her in answer to her prayers.

Gregory studied at Cæsarea, Alexandria and Athens, and became proficient in Greek oratory and poetry. He contracted in youth a friendship for St. Basil which lasted through life. The two sought together the solitude of the desert, whence Gregory was afterwards summoned to assist his aged father in the cares of the Episcopate. He was soon after ordained priest by his father, and then bishop, by St. Basil. Gregory, however, soon after abandoned his see for the solitude, but emerged thence again at the instance of his decrepit father, and executed the episcopal functions in Nazianzus without assuming the name of bishop. After the death of his parent, he again sought the desert, but was brought thence by his friends, and placed in the see of Constantinople. He was favored by Theodosius the Great, and resisted the swarming heresies of the time, chief among which was the heresy of Arius.

After enumerating in succession all the books of the New Testament, excepting the Apocalypse, he concludes:

"Si quid est extra hunc numerum non est ex germanis Scripturis."

In the celebrated *Carmen ad Seleucum*, a Canon occurs differing from the foregoing only in this, that he admits in it Esther, which did not appear in the first *Carmen*, and also the Apocalypse with the qualification:

"Apocalypsim autem Johannis
Quidam vero admittunt, pars vero major
Spuriam asserunt."

Basing their judgment on this difference in the Canons, and on the testimony of some codices, some have denied to Gregory the authorship of the *Carmen ad Seleucum*, and have attributed it to Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium (344—394), the friend of Gregory, called by him the "irreproachable pontiff," the "angel," and "hero of truth." The opinion rests principally on the authority of Combefis, the editor of Amphilochius' works, and in my judgment has little foundation. I see no good reason for denying to Gregory this *Carmen*, since the presence of Esther and the Apocalypse therein would simply show that Gregory, in endeavoring to follow the trend of religious thought, could not be consistent in excluding books which the Church considered divine.

Gregory concludes his canon in the *Carmen ad Seleucum* with these words:

—"His certissimus
Canon tibi sit divinarum Scripturarum."

It would seem, at first sight, that these testimonies manifest a certain opposition to the deuterocanonical books. However, in the *Carmen ad Seleucum*, 252-257, Gregory

The perfidy and envy of his enemies induced him to resign again the see of Constantinople, and he finally sought the solitude of the desert again, where he died in 389 A. D.

Gregory was by nature severe and inclined to the life of an ascetic. His vast erudition caused Jerome to journey to Constantinople to hear him. His writings are at times excessively ornate, and sometimes uncritical. His chief works are fifty-five orations, a great number of letters, and many poems.

declares that he allows to the deuterocanonical books a sort of middle place between uninspired and inspired Scripture:

"Non omnis liber pro certo habendus
 Qui venerandum Scripturæ nomen præfert.
 Sunt enim, sunt (ut nonnunquam fit) inscripti falsi nominis
 Libri : *nonnulli quidem intermedii sunt ac vicini,*
Ut ita dixerim, veritatis doctrinæ ;
 Alii vero spurii et magnopere periculosi."

Gregory accorded to the deuterocanonical books a middle rank. He made a distinction much like that made of old by the Jews in assigning an inferior degree of inspiration to the products of the "Filia vocis." This was an erroneous explanation of a fact. The fact was that these books bore the name of divine Scripture; they entered into the deposit of faith of the Church; the faithful learned them by memory; Gregory himself, as we shall see by numerous passages from his writings, had drunk deeply from these fountains.

On the other hand, they were not in the official list of the Synagogue. This alone was sufficient to cast such doubt upon them with the extremely conservative Cappadocian school, of which Gregory is a representative exponent, that they stopped short of inserting them in the Canon; at the same time they honored them as sources of divine truth.

The other Cappadocian Fathers, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa and Cæsarius, frequently cite Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, as they are the books most fitted for dogmatic argument.

Basil quotes Judith:

Judith IX. 4.

"Tu enim fecisti priora, et illa post illa cogitasti, et hoc factum est quod ipse voluisti."

II. Maccab. VII. 1.

"Contigit autem et septem fratres una cum matre sua apprehensos compelli a rege edere contra fas carnes porcinas, flagris, et taureis cruciatos."

Lib. De Spiritu Sancto VIII.
 19.

"Sicuti Judith: 'Cogitasti,' inquit, 'et præsto fuerunt omnia quæ cogitasti.'"

Epist. VI. ad Nectarii uxorem, 1.

"Maccabæorum mater septem filiorum mortem conspexit, nec ingemuit, nec ignobiles lacrymas effudit, sed gratias agens Deo quod videret eos igne et ferro et acerbissimis verberibus e vinculis carnis exsolvi,

Deo quidem probata fuit, celebris vero habita est apud homines."

How deeply Gregory had been influenced by the practical usage of the Church can be learned from the following collated passages:

Dan. XIII. 5.

"Et constituti sunt de populo duo senes iudices in illo anno: de quibus locutus est Dominus: Quia egressa est iniquitas de Babylone, a senioribus iudicibus, qui videbantur regere populum."

Eccli. III. 11.

"Benedictio patris firmat domos filiorum—."

Sap. V. 15.

"—quoniam spes impii tamquam lanugo est, quæ a vento tollitur," etc.

Sap. XVI. 13.

"Tu es enim, Domine, qui vitæ et mortis habes potestatem, et deducis ad portas mortis, et reducis.—"

Eccli. XXXVIII. 16.

"Fili, in mortuum produci lacrymas, et quasi dira passus, incipe plorare," etc.

Sap. III. 15.

"Bonorum enim laborum gloriosus est fructus," etc.

Sap. V. 10, 11.

"—et tamquam navis, quæ pertransit fluctuantem aquam: cujus, cum præterierit, non est vestigium invenire, neque semitam carinæ illius in fluctibus:

St. Greg. Naz. Orat. II. 64.

"—nempe quod egressa est iniquitas ex Babylone a senioribus iudicibus qui populum regere videbantur."

Ibid. 96.

"Benedictio enim Patris firmat domos filiorum."

Orat. V. 28.

"—tamquam lanugo quæ a vento disjicitur—."

Ibid. 29.

"Ecquis novit num Deus qui solvit compeditos, gravemque et *'humis vergentem a portis mortis in altum subvehit—'*"

Orat. VII. 1.

"Super mortuum plora, et quasi dira passus, incipe plorare."

Ibid. 14.

"Bonorum enim laborum gloriosus est fructus."

Ibid. 19.

"Insomnium sumus, minime consistens, spectrum quoddam, quod teneri non potest, avis prætereuntis volatus, navis in mari vestigium non habens,

aut tamquam avis, quæ transvolat in aëre, cujus nullum invenitur argumentum itineris," etc.

Sap. I. 4.

"—quoniam in malevolam animam non introibit sapientia, nec habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis."

Eccli. VI. 14, 15.

"Amicus fidelis, protectio fortis: qui autem invenit illum, invenit thesaurum. Amico fideli nulla est comparatio, et non est digna ponderatio auri et argenti contra bonitatem fidei illius."

Eccli. I. 2.

"Arenam maris, et pluviae guttas, et dies sæculi quis dinumeravit? Altitudinem cœli, et latitudinem terræ, et profundum abyssi quis dimensus est?"

pulvis, vapor, ros matutinus, flos momento nascens et momento marcescens."

Orat. IX. 2.

"In malignam enim animam non ingressuram sapientiam recte dictum est."

Orat. XI. 1.

"Amico fideli nulla est comparatio; nec ulla est digna ponderatio contra bonitatem illius. Amicus fidelis, protectio fortis."

Orat. XIV. 30.

"Sed quis arenam maris et pluviae guttas et abyssi profunditatem metiri . . . queat?"

The fifteenth oration of St. Gregory is in praise of the Maccabees, whose feast the Church celebrated in his day. Frequently in the course of the oration he adverts to data taken from the first and second Books of Maccabees. The very fact that he composed such an oration shows clearly that he recognized the books. Cornely's animadversion here that Gregory has in mind only the fourth book, is erroneous. [Cornely, *Introduc. Gen.* p. 98, note 18.] Gregory in the second paragraph speaks of a book, *qui rationem perturbationibus animi imperare docet*, which evidently refers to the apocryphal fourth book of Maccabees, but this would only show that he united the fourth with the others in collecting his argument. Most of the data of the oration are taken from the first and second Books of Maccabees.

Eccli. XI. 30.

"Ante mortem ne laudes hominem quemquam, quoniam in filiis suis agnoscitur vir."

Baruch II. 12.

"—peccavimus, impie egimus, inique gessimus, Domine Deus noster, in omnibus justitiis tuis."

Dan. XIV. 33.

"Dixitque angelus Domini ad Habacuc: Fer prandium, quod habes, in Babylonem Danieli, qui est in lacu leonum."

Sap. XI. 21.

"Sed et sine his uno spiritu poterant occidi persecutionem passi ab ipsis factis suis, et dispersi per spiritum virtutis tuæ: sed omnia in mensura, et numero et pondere disposuisti."

Dan. XIII.

Sap. I. 7.

"Quoniam spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum, et hoc, quod continet omnia, scientiam habet vocis."

Orat. XVI. 3.

"Nam si, ut ego cum Salomone sentio, hominem ante mortem beatum prædicare non oportet."

Ibid. 12.

"—adjungam: Peccavimus, inique egimus, impietatem fecimus."

Orat. XVIII. 30.

"—aut per prophetam in sublimi raptum satians, ut Danieli, em, antea cum fame in lacu premeretur."

Orat. XXIV. 1.

"—atque ut hinc initium ducamus, quam commode, pulchrisque Dei mensuris, qui omnia cum pondere et mensura constituit ac moderatur," etc.

Ibid. 10.

"(Deus) qui et Susannam mortis periculo liberavit, et Theclam servavit; illam a sævis senioribus, hanc a tyranno ipsius proco et a matri adhuc crudeliori."

Orat. XXVIII. 8.

"—ait Scriptura . . . 'Spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum.'"

Orat. XXIX. 17. He calls the Son of God "Imago bonitatis," evidently assuming the phrase from Wisdom, VII. 26.

Baruch III. 36-38.

"Hic est Deus noster, et non æstimabitur alius adversus eum.

Post hæc in terris visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

Orat. XXX. 13.

"'Hic Deus tuus, et non æstimabitur alius præter eum.' Et paucis interjectis: 'Post hæc in terra visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est.'"

Sap. VII. 22.

"Est enim in illa spiritus intelligentiæ, sanctus, unicus, multiplex, subtilis, disertus, mobilis," etc.

Orat. XXXI. 29.

"Spiritus intelligens, multiplex, apertus, clarus, incontaminatus, minimeque impeditus," etc.

Sap. I. 4.

"Quoniam in malevolam animam non introibit sapientia, nec habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis."

Orat. XXXII. 12.

"—quoniam in malevolam animam non introibit sapientia."

Sap. III. 11.

"Sapientiam enim, et disciplinam qui abjicit, infelix est: et vacua est spes illorum, et labores sine fructu, et inutilia opera eorum."

Ibid. 20.

"—ac Deus faxit ne quid unquam huic occupationi prævertendum ducam, ne alioqui ab ipsa Sapientia miser appeller, ut sapientiam et eruditionem spernens ac pro nihilo ducens."

Eccli. V. 14.

"Si est tibi intellectus, responde proximo: sin autem, sit manus tua super os tuum, ne capiaris in verbo indisciplinato, et confundaris."

Ibid. 21.

"Si est tibi sermo prudentiæ, inquit ille, nec quisquam prohibebit: sin minus, hæreat vinculum labiis tuis."

Eccli. VII. 15.

"Noli verbosus esse in multitudine presbyterorum."

Ibid.

"Noli celer esse in verbis, admonet Sapiens."

Eccli. XI. 27.

"In die bonorum ne immemor sis malorum, et in die malorum ne immemor sis bonorum.—"

Orat XXXV. 3.

"In die enim lætitiæ, inquit, malorum oblivio est."

Dan. XIII. 5.

"Et constituti sunt de populo duo senes iudices in illo anno, de quibus locutus est Dominus: Quia egressa est iniquitas de Babylone a senioribus iudicibus, qui videbantur regere populum."

Dan. XIII. 42.

"Exclamavit autem voce magna Susanna, et dixit: Deus æterne, qui absconditorum es cognitor, qui nosti omnia antequam fiant."

Eccli. III. 11.

"Benedictio patris firmat domos filiorum: maledictio autem matris eradicat fundamenta."

Eccli. III. 12.

"Ne glorieris in contumelia patris," etc.

Eccli. I. 16.

"Initium sapientiæ, timor Domini, et cum fidelibus in vulva concreatus est, cum electis feminis graditur, et cum justis et fidelibus agnoscitur."

Sap. III. 7.

"Fulgebunt iusti, et tamquam scintillæ in arundinetis discurrent."

Eccli. XXXII. 3.

"—ut læteris propter illos, et ornamentum gratiæ accipias coronam, et dignationem consequaris corrogationis."

Orat. XXXVI. 3.

"—juxta Daniele egressa est iniquitas a senioribus Babylonicis, qui Israelem regere existimabantur."

Ibid. 7.

"—imo non videor, sed perspicuus atque manifestus sum ei qui omnia priusquam oriantur novit."

Orat. XXXVII. 6.

"Item alio loco: 'Benedictio patris firmat domos filiorum; maledictio autem matris eradicat fundamenta.' "

Ibid. 18.

"Quod si hoc etiam probas: 'Fili, ne glorieris de ignominia patris.' "

Orat. XXXIX. 8.

"Unde Salomon nobis legem statuit: 'Principium sapientiæ,' inquit, 'posside sapientiam.' Quidnam vocat hoc principium sapientiæ? 'Timorem.' "

Orat. XL. 6.

"—quo tempore nimirum iusti fulgebunt sicut sol."

Ibid. 18.

"Honore eum complectere ut te ornet, capitique tuo gratiarum coronam nectat."

Sap. IV. 8.

"Senectus enim venerabilis est non diuturna, neque annorum numero computata: cani autem sunt sensus hominis."

II. Maccab. VII. 1.

"Contigit autem et septem fratres una cum matre sua apprehensos compelli a rege edere contra fas carnes porcinas, flagris, et taureis cruciatis."

Sap. II. 24.

"Invidia autem diaboli mors introivit," etc.

The reference to Judith V. 6, in Orat. XLV. 15: "quod et semen Chaldaicum sublatum atque oppressum Scriptura vocat," is somewhat uncertain.

Eccli. III. 11.

"Benedictio patris firmat domos filiorum: maledictio autem matris eradicat fundamenta."

Baruch III. 38.

"Post hæc in terris visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

Eccli. IV. 32.

"Noli resistere contra faciem potentis, nec coneris contra ictum fluvii."

Eccli. XXXI. 32.

"Æqua vita hominibus vinum in sobrietate: si bibas illud moderate, eris sobrius."

Orat. XLIII. 23.

"Quis prudentia perinde canus erat, etiam ante canitiem? Quandoquidem hac re senectutem Salomon quoque definiuit."

Ibid. 74.

"Mitto septem Maccabæorum dimicationem qui cum sacerdote et matre in sanguine atque omnis generis tormentis consummati sunt."

Orat. XLIV. 4.

"Quoniam autem invidia diaboli mors in mundum introivit," etc.

St. Greg. Epist. LXI.

"Ita fiet ut ab ea non modo pecunias habeatis, sed materiam etiam benedictionem, filiorum domos fulcientem, consequamini."

Epist. CII.

"—atque ad hæc verba confugientes: 'Post hæc in terra visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est.'"

Epist. CLXXVIII.

"Porro non esse vi cohibendum fluminis cursum, parœmia quoque ipsa docet."

Epist. CLXXXI.

"Sin autem tibi præstantiore monitore opus est, illud quidem monet Salomon ut cum consilio vinum bibas, ne mundi hujus temulentia et vertigine agaris."

These references leave no doubt that Gregory believed that he was there quoting divine Scripture. The whole Church used them, committed them to memory, proved and illustrated their dogmas by them. This influence was so powerful that even the most conservative came under it, and as we shall see, even those who wished to turn the tide of this tradition were inconsistent. Another Oriental authority of this period that is objected against us is the sixtieth canon of the Council of Laodicea. This canon explicitly defines that the books to be read in the Church are those which we now comprehend in the protocanonical class. The date of the Council of Laodicea is uncertain, but it is generally believed to have been celebrated about the middle of the fourth century. Some have doubted the genuineness of the sixtieth canon [Herbst, Vincenzi, Malou, Danko], but as it is recognized by Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* I. p. 749-751, we shall not base our treatment of it upon its doubtful character. Admitting all its claims, it simply establishes that some bishops of Phrygia in a particular council refused to allow to be read publicly in the Church any book excepting those that were absolutely certain. We are not endeavoring to prove that the position of protocanonical and deuterocanonical books were equal in the early ages of the Church. Their equality was wrought by the Council of Trent. What we wish to show is that these books were known to the early Christians, venerated by them, committed to memory by them, and considered by them as the inspired word of God.

The Council in Trullo, which the Greeks hold to be ecumenical, received the Canons of the Council of Laodicea, but, as they also received the Canons of the Council of Carthage, they evidently intended that the decree concerning the canonical Scriptures should be modified in accordance with the complete Canon of the Council of Carthage.

The Greeks also in the Council in Trullo received various Apocryphal documents of the fifth century called the Canons of the Apostles. The eighty-fifth canon of this collection is sometimes cited against us, as it does not contain any of the deuterocanonical books, save the books of Maccabees. This canon can have no weight, since it embraces three books of

Maccabees, two epistles of St. Clement of Rome, and the eight books of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*.

The Council in Trullo in receiving this Canon could not have excluded the Canon of the Council of Carthage, whose decrees and canons it ratified. In fact, the Council in Trullo expressly stated that the *Constitutiones Apost.* were adulterated, and hence not to be read. It seems, however, due to this canon that the Greeks, even to this day, recognize as canonical three books of Maccabees.

We can scarcely expect the guiding hand of the Holy Ghost in the members who composed the Council in Trullo.

One who candidly examines the data here presented must admit that the Oriental Church during the fourth and fifth centuries recognized and used the deuterocanonical books as divine Scripture.

Turning now from the East to the West, we meet the first objection taken from the writings of St. Hilary.* The objection is found in the fifteenth paragraph of his Prologue on the Book of Psalms. After seeking mystic reasons for the number eight in the Scriptures, he proceeds as follows:

“And this is the cause that the law of the Old Testament is divided into twenty-two books, that they might agree with the number of letters. These books are arranged according to the traditions of the ancients, so that five are of Moses,

*St. Hilary was born in Poitiers in France in the opening years of the fourth century. His parents were pagans of noble rank. They procured for their son every educational advantage, and the youth, applying himself with diligence, soon came to be regarded as the most learned man of his age. His reading of the Holy Scriptures brought him to recognize the truth of the Christian faith, which he, his wife, and child Abra embraced. He was consecrated Bishop of Poitiers in 350 or 355 and became the staunch defender of the Church against Arianism. The Arian Saturninus of Arles banished Hilary to Phrygia. He was called from his exile to be present at the Council of Seleucia; in which council he made such head against the Arians that to rid themselves of such a powerful antagonist they sent him back to France. The people received him as a hero from the arena, victorious over the heretics. He set in order his diocese, and there passed the remaining years of his holy life. He died in 367 or 368. His most celebrated work is his *Twelve Books on the Trinity*, composed during his exile in Phrygia. This treatise is a classic work on the Trinity. He has left also *Commentaries on the Psalms and Gospels*, a treatise *De Fide Orientalium*, and numerous other shorter works.

the sixth is of Jesus Nave, the seventh is Judges and Ruth, the first and second of Kings form the eighth; the third and fourth (of Kings) form the ninth; the two books of Paralipomenon form the tenth; the discourses of the days of Ezra form the eleventh; the book of Psalms, the twelfth; Solomon's proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticle of Canticles form the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth; the twelve Prophets form the sixteenth; while Isaiah, then Jeremiah, the Lamentations and the Epistle, Daniel, Ezechiel, Job, and Esther complete the number of twenty-two books." Hilary gives only the protocanonical works, and then continues:

"To some it has seemed good to add Tobias and Judith, and thus constitute twenty-four books according to the Greek alphabet," etc.

We see here an excessive mysticism impelling a man to reject or admit a book for the sole purpose of completing a mystic number. This tendency had been brought into patristic thought by Origen and the Alexandrian school. Hilary does not reject the deuterocanonical books, but considers the protocanonical as forming a class by themselves. Hilary's weak, unsubstantial arguments are attributable to the man impressed by the spirit of his age. The great current of tradition was greater than any one man, and drew Hilary with it, so that we find him ranking the deuterocanonical books on an equal footing with the others, as the following quotations will show:

Eccli. I. 33.

"Fili, concupiscens sapientiam, conserva justitiam, et Deus præbebit illam tibi."

Eccli. XI. 30.

"Ante mortem ne laudes hominem quemquam, quoniam in filiis suis agnoscitur vir."

Dan. XIII. 56.

"Et, amoto eo, jussit venire alium, et dixit ei: Semen Chanaan, et non Juda," etc.

St. Hilary Prol. in Ps. 20.

"—secundum id quod dictum est: 'Desiderasti sapientiam? Serva mandata, et Dominus præstabit tibi eandem.'"

Tract. in XIV. Ps. 14.

"Idcirco apud Salomonem omnis laus in exitu canitur."

Tract. in LII. Ps. 19.

"Sed et Daniel presbyteros condemnans ita dicit: 'Non semen Abraham, sed semen Chanaan, et non Juda.'"

Eccli. I. 16.

"Initium sapientiæ, timor Domini," etc.

Baruch III. 38.

"Post hæc in terris visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est."

Sap. XVII. 1.

"Magna sunt enim judicia tua, Domine, et inenarrabilia," etc."

Sap. VII. 27.

"Et cum sit una, omnia potest: et in se permanens, omnia innovat, et per nationes in animas sanctas se transfert: amicos Dei et prophetas constituit."

Sap. I. 7.

"Quoniam spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum," etc.

II. Maccab. VI. 18 VII. 1. et seqq.

Judith XVI. 3.

"Dominus conterens bella, Dominus nomen est illi."

Tract. in Ps. LXVI. 9.

"Et per Salomonem: 'Initium sapientiæ timor Domini est.'"

Tract. in Ps. LXVIII. 19.

"—postea in terris visus sit, et inter homines conversatus sit."

Tract. in Ps. CXVIII. 8.

"—et rursus *propheta*: 'Magna enim sunt judicia tua, et inenarrabilia.'"

Ibid. Littera V. 9.

"Si Apostoli docent, prior ille docuit: 'Constituit enim Sapientia amicos Dei et prophetas.'"

Ibid. Littera XIX. 8.

"Et Spiritus Dei, secundum Prophetam, replevit orbem terrarum."

Tract. in Ps. CXXV. 4.

"Testes sunt mihi tres pueri inter flammas cantantes (Dan. III. 24 et seqq.), testis Daniel in fame leonum prophetæ prandio saturatus (Dan. XIV. 35); testis Eleazar inter jura dominorum patriis suis legibus liber; testes cum matre sua martyres septem, Deo gratias inter nova mortis tormenta referentes."

Tract. in Ps. CXXV. 6.

"—et cantantes *ex Lege*: 'Dominus conterens bella, Dominus nomen est illi.'"

Certainly Hilary denied not inspiration to a book which he honored by the august name of the "Law."

Sap. VIII. 2.

"Hanc amavi, et exquisivi a juventute mea, et quæsivi sponsam mihi eam assumere, et amator factus sum formæ illius."

Ibid. 3.

"Generositatem illius glorificat contubernium habens Dei: sed et omnium Dominus dilexit illam—."

Ibid. 8.

"Et si multitudinem scientiæ, desiderat quis, scit præterita, et de futuris æstimat," etc.

Ibid. 2.

(Already quoted.)

Tob. XII. 12.

"Quando orabas cum lacrymis et sepeliebas mortuos, et derelinquebas prandium tuum, et mortuos abscondebas per diem in domo tua, et nocte sepeliebas eos, ego obtuli orationem tuam Domino."

II. Maccab. VI. 21.

"Hi autem, qui astabant, iniqua miseratione commoti, propter antiquam viri amicitiam, tollentes eum secreto, rogabant afferri carnes, quibus vesci ei licebat, ut simularetur manducasse, sicut rex imperaverat de sacrificii carnibus—."

Tract. in Ps. CXXVIII. 9.

"Salomon itaque ait: 'Quæsivi sapientiam sponsam adducere mihi ipsi.'"

Ibid.

"—hujus sponsæ suæ opes memorat dicens: 'Honestatem glorificat convictum Dei habens, et omnium Dominus dilexit eam.'"

Ibid.

"—et si multam quis cognitionem desiderat, novit et quæ a principio sunt, et quæ futura sunt conspicit."

Ibid.

"—de qua et rursum ait: 'Judicavi igitur hanc adducere ad convivendum mecum, et amator factus sum pulchritudinis ejus.'"

Tract. in Ps. CXXIX. 7.

"Sunt, secundum Raphael ad Tobiam loquentem, angeli assistentes ante claritatem Dei, et orationes deprecantium ad Deum deferentes."

Tract. in Ps. CXXXIV. 25.

"Sanctus etiam Eleazar, cum a principibus populi sui degustare ementitum sacrificium cogeretur, gloriam martyrii sub hac eadem voce consummat, sciens," etc.

Sap. I. 7.

"Quoniam spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum," etc.

Eccli. XXVIII. 28, 29.

"Sepi aures tuas spinis, linguam nequam noli audire, et ori tuo facito ostia, et seras. Aurum tuum et argentum tuum confla, et verbis tuis facito stateram, et frenos ori tuo rectos—."

Sap. II. 12, 13.

"Circumveniamus ergo justum, quoniam inutilis est nobis, et contrarius est operibus nostris, . . . et filium Dei se nominat."

Sap. XIII. 5.

"—a magnitudine enim speciei et creaturæ, cognoscibiliter poterit Creator horum videri."

Dan. XIII. 42.

"Exclamavit autem voce magna Susanna, et dixit: Deus æterne, qui absconditorum es cognitor, qui nosti omnia, antequam fiant—."

II. Maccab. VII. 28.

"Peto, nate, ut aspicias ad cælum et terram, et ad omnia quæ in eis sunt, et intelligas, quia ex nihilo fecit illa Deus, et hominum genus—."

Tract. in Ps. CXXXV. 11.

"—docet *propheta* dicens: 'Spiritus Dei replevit orbem terrarum.' "

Tract. in Ps. CXL. 5.

"—ita monemur: 'Ecce circumvalla possessionem tuam spinis; argentum et aurum tuum constitue, et ori tuo fac ostium, et seram, et verbis tuis jugum et mensuram.' "

Tract. de Ps. XLI. 12.

"Vox cataractæ fuit: 'Opprimamus justum, quia inutilis est nobis, et contrarius est operibus nostris, et filium Dei se nominat.' "

De Trinitate Lib. I. 7.

"—hunc de Deo pulcherrimæ sententiæ modum prophetis vocibus apprehendit: 'De magnitudine enim operum et pulchritudine creaturarum consequenter generationum Conditor conspicitur.' "

Ibid. Lib. IV. 8.

"—sicut beata Susanna dicit: 'Deus æterne, absconditorum cognitor, sciens omnia ante generationem eorum.' "

Ibid. 16.

"Omnia enim *secundum Prophetam* facta ex nihilo sunt."

II. Maccab. VII. 9.

"—et in ultimo spiritu constitutus, sic ait: Tu quidem, scelestissime, in præsenti vita nos perdis: sed Rex mundi defunctos nos pro suis legibus in æternæ vitæ resurrectione suscitabit."

Eccli. XXI. 1.

"Fili, peccasti? non adjicias iterum: sed et de pristinis deprecare, ut tibi dimittentur."

Sap. II. 23.

"Quoniam Deus creavit hominem inexterminabilem," etc.

Sap. VI. 8.

"Non enim subtrahet personam cujusquam Deus, nec veretur magnitudinem cujusquam; quoniam pusillum et magnum ipse fecit, et æqualiter cura est illi de omnibus."

Lib. Contra Const. Imp. 6.

"—sciat a martyre esse dictum regi Antiocho: 'Tu quidem, iniquus, de presenti vita nos perdis, sed Rex mundi defunctos nos pro suis legibus in æternam vitam in resurrectione suscitabit.' "

Ex Operibus Historicis Frag.

III. 24.

"Nec Dominum audiunt dicentem: 'Peccasti? quiesce.' "

Epistola VIII.

"Salomon clamat dicens: 'Deus condidit hominem ad immortalitatem.' "

Ibid. IX.

"Clamat Propheta dicens: 'Et pauperem et divitem ego feci, et pro omnibus æqualis cura est mihi.' "

Hilary has here explicitly canonized every deuterocanonical book. He sought the mystic number in the books that the Hebrews received, not with the view to exclude the others from divine inspiration but only classifying the Scriptures of the Old Testament in two general categories which existed down to the time of the Council of Trent.

The next objection which is urged against us is taken from the fragmentary writing of Rufinus.* The objection is

*Rufinus was born at Concordia, a small village of Italy, towards the middle of the fourth century. He early devoted himself to the acquisition of knowledge, for which cause he took up his abode at Aquileja, whose renown as a seat of learning had merited for it the name of the second Rome. A desire for sanctity drew him into a monastery in this city wherein St. Jerome first met him. There was formed between Jerome and Rufinus the closest friendship, so that when Jerome left Aquileja to journey through France and Germany, Rufinus, inconsolable by the separation, went in search of him.

taken from the *Commentarius in Symbolum Apostolorum* 36-38: "And therefore it seems apposite to clearly enumerate, as we have received from the testimonies of the Fathers, the books of the Old and New Testaments, which, according to the tradition of the ancients, are believed to be inspired by the Holy Ghost, and delivered to the Church." Then follows a list of only the protocanonical works. Continuing, he says: "It is to be known, however, that there are other books which have been called by the Fathers not canonical but ecclesiastical. Such are the Wisdom which is called of Solomon, and the other Wisdom which is called of the Son of Sirach, which book in the Latin tongue is called by the general term of *Ecclesiasticus*, by which term not the author but the quality of the Scripture is designated. Of the same order are the books of Tobias and Judith and the books of Maccabees, and in the New Testament the book which is called the Pastor of Hermas, and the Two Ways or

Rufinus visited Egypt, and there formed a lasting friendship with the celebrated St. Melania. He suffered many persecutions from the Arians. He was sent into exile, from which Melania ransomed him, and both retired to Palestine.

The esteem in which Jerome at this time held Rufinus may be known from the following, written to a friend in Jerusalem: "You will see shine in Rufinus the character of sanctity, while I am but dust. My feeble eyes can scarce bear the effulgence of his virtues. He comes even now from the cleansing crucible of persecution, and is now whiter than snow, while I am stained by all sorts of sins."

Rufinus built a monastery on Mt. Olivet, and there labored zealously and fruitfully in apostolic work. Having become conversant with Greek while in Alexandria, he translated into Latin various works of the Greek tongue. Among others, he translated the *Principles of Origen*. This led to a rupture with St. Jerome, and there is nothing so bitter in patristic literature as Jerome's subsequent invective against Rufinus. This division was a cause of much scandal in the Church. That Rufinus led a saintly life can not be doubted, but it seems quite certain that he became in his later years infected with the errors of Origen. Rufinus declared that he had acted as a mere translator of the works of Origen, and Pope Anastasius, before whom he was cited, declared that he would leave to God to judge of his intention. We must do the same, but in justification to St. Jerome, it must be said that his zeal for orthodoxy caused him to repudiate the man whom he had once called friend.

The most important of Rufinus' works are: *De Benedictioibus Patriarcharum*, *Commentarius in Symbolum Apostolorum*, *Historia Monachorum*, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *Apologia contra Hieronymum* and an *Apologia ad Anastasium Papam*. He died in Sicily in 410.

Choice of Peter. All these books, they (the Fathers) wished to be read in the churches, but not to be used for the confirmation of dogma."

The testimony of Rufinus well illustrates the position of the deuterocanonical books in that age. The Church, as the divine institution of Christ, used them, and the faithful drew their spiritual teaching from them. At the same time, some of the Fathers induced a scientific distinction between them and the books of the first canon. This scientific distinction was purely a *critical judgment of the Fathers*, and was not aimed at denying to these books divine inspiration. There had been no decree of the Church, and these books had not as much *extrinsically* in their favor as the others. The extremely conservative spirit of the Fathers was content to use them as divine Scripture in their practical use of Scripture; while, in drawing up official lists of Scriptures, they hesitated to make them equal with the books which the Church had received from the Synagogue. In the growth and development of doctrine, this hesitancy has been excluded by the vital power in the Church. In the few writings of Rufinus which remain to us, we find the following quotations of deuterocanonical Scripture:

Eccli XXXIV. 9.

"Qui non est tentatus, quid scit? Vir in multis expertus, cogitabit multa; et qui multa didicit, enarrabit intellectum."

Eccli. XI. 30.

"Ante mortem ne laudes hominem quemquam, quoniam in filiis suis agnoscitur vir."

Baruch III. 36-38.

"Hic est Deus noster, et non æstimabitur alius adversus eum. Hic adinvenit omnem viam disciplinæ, et tradidit illam Jacob puero suo, et Israel dilecto suo. Post hæc in terris visus est, et

Benedictio Gad 3.

"—ita enim *Scriptura* dicit: 'Qui non est tentatus, non est probabilis.' "

Benedictio Joseph 3.

"—sed et *sanctæ Scripturæ sententia* est: 'Ne laudaveris quemquam ante obitum.' "

Comment. in Symbolum Apost.

5.

"Quod et Propheta prædixerat ubi ait: 'Hic Deus noster, non reputabitur alter ad eum. Invenit omnem viam disciplinæ, et dedit eam Jacob puero suo et Israel dilecto suo; post hæc in

cum hominibus conversatus est." terris visus est et inter homines conversatus est."

Sap. III. 7.

Ibid. 46.

"Fulgébunt justī, et tamquam scintillæ in arundinetō discurrent."

"—non erit difficile credere etiam illa quæ *Prophetæ prædixerant*: 'Quod justī scilicet fulgebunt sicut sol, et sicut splendor firmamenti in regno Dei.'"

Certainly the man who quoted these lines believed that he was employing Holy Scripture.

In his *Apologia Contra Hieronymum*, Lib. II. from the thirty-second to the thirty-seventh paragraph, Rufinus bitterly inveighs against St. Jerome for having dared to cut off the deuterocanonical books.* Hence in justice and right, Rufinus must be considered in every way favorable to the deuterocanonical works. We now come to the Achilles of our adversaries, St. Jerome, a man more versed in the Scriptures than any other of the Fathers up to his day. He has in many places, in no dubious terms, expressed his opposition to the deuterocanonical books. As Jerome is inseparably linked with the Latin Vulgate, we deem it not amiss to insert here an abstract of his life.

Jerome was born about the year 342 at Stridon, on the borders of Dalmatia and Pannonia, in the midst of a semi-barbaric population [De viris illustribus, cap. CXXXV.]

*An ut divinarum Scripturarum libros, quos ad plenissimum fidei Instrumentum Ecclesiis Christi Apostoli tradiderunt, nova nunc et a Judæis mutata interpretatione mutares? . . . Quis præsumserit sacras Sancti Spiritus voces et divina Volumina temerare? Quis præter te divino munerī et Apostolorum hæreditati manus intulerit.

Et quidem cum ingens copia fuisse ex initio in Ecclesiis Dei, et precipue Jerosolymis eorum, qui ex circumcisione crediderant, referatur, in quibus utique linguæ utriusque perfectam fuisse scientiam, et legis peritiam probabilem, administrati pontificatus testatur officium. Quis ergo in ista eruditorum virorum copia ausus est Instrumentum divinum, quod Apostoli Ecclesiis tradiderunt, et depositum Sancti Spiritus compilare? An non est compilare cum quædam quidem immutantur, et error dicitur corrigi? Nam omnis illa historia de Susanna, quæ castitatis exemplum præbebat Ecclesiis Dei, ab isto abscissa est et abjecta atque posthabita. Trium puerorum hymnus, qui maxime diebus solemnibus in Ecclesia Dei canitur, ab isto e loco suo penitus erasus est. Et quid per singula com-

His parents, however, were wealthy Christians, and in a letter to Theophilus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, he testified to the pious care which from his earliest childhood had nourished him with the milk of the Catholic doctrine. [Epist. LXXII. ad Theophilum, 2.] He was called Eusebius after his father, for Hieronymus or Heirome was merely a surname, or what in Latin is termed cognomen. His mother's name we do not know. Besides an aunt, Castorina, who seems to have shown him small affection, [Epist. XIII. ad Castorinam Materteram] Jerome had a sister, a cause of many anxieties, and one brother, Paulinian, whom he later took with him to Palestine from Rome.

The young Dalmatian began his studies at Stridon, and at the age of eighteen he went with Bonosus, a friend of his childhood, to continue them at Rome, where he attended the lessons of Donatus, the grammarian, and possibly those of Victorinus, whose humble and courageous conversion has been immortalized in the Confessions of St. Augustine. [Confession, lib. VIII., cap. 11.]

Reading, in which his eager soul found its outlet (he tells us himself that he studied Prophyry's Introduction, Alexander of Aphrodisias' Commentaries upon Aristotle, and Plato's Dialogues), completed his masters' teaching; and his passion for books, which he confesses were indispensable to him, enabled him to acquire, at the cost of the most arduous

memoro de his, quorum comprehendere numerum nequeo? De quo ut omittam illud dicere, quod Septuaginta duorum virorum per cellulas interpretantium unam et consonam vocem, dubitandum non est, Spiritus Sancti inspiratione prolatam, et majoris id debere esse auctoritatis, quam id quod ab uno homine, sibi Barraba aspirante, translatus est. Ut ergo hoc omittam, vide quid dicimus, verbi causa. Petrus Romanæ Ecclesiæ per viginti et quatuor annos præfuit: dubitandum non est, quin sicut cætera, quæ ad instructionem pertinent, etiam librorum Instrumenta Ecclesiæ ipse tradiderit, quæ utique jam tunc, ipso sedente et docente, recitabantur? Quid ergo? Decepit Petrus Apostolus Christi Ecclesiam, et libros ei falsos et nihil veritatis continentes tradidit, et cum sciret, quod verum est haberi apud Judæos, apud Christianos volebat haberi quod falsum est? Sed fortasse dicit, quia sine literis erat Petrus, et sciebat quidem Judæorum libros magis esse veros, quam istos, qui erant in Ecclesia: sed interpretari non poterat propter sermonis imperitiam? Et quid? Nihil in isto agebat ignea lingua per Spiritum Sanctum cælitus data? Non ergo omnibus linguis loquebantur Apostoli? . . .

labor, that is by copying them with his own hand, an extensive library. Epist. XXII ad Eustochium, 30.] Thus was Jerome unconsciously preparing himself for the great works which were to fill his life.

He was as yet only a catechumen, for in those early centuries they frequently waited until the perilous ways of youth had been safely traversed before conferring baptism, and the Christian initiation was sometimes deferred from reasons of prudence. To know, however, that this prudence was liable to terrible mistakes one has only to recall the anguish of Gregory Nazianzen and of Satirus, St. Ambrose's brother, who both, when overtaken by a tempest at sea, were terrified at the thought of dying unbaptized. It was especially the fear of the restraints imposed by the Christian life which deferred for years the baptism of many, and we are told by St. Augustine that the deviations of the unbaptized were freely excused by a spirit of general tolerance. [Confession, lib. I., cap. XI.]

More fortunate in this respect than the son of Monica, Jerome, as he wrote to Theophilus of Alexandria, never fell into error. He used often to interrupt his studies in order to visit the basilicas of the saints or to descend into the catacombs, and when an old man he thus described these pilgrimages in his "Commentaries upon Ezekiel." "In my youth, when I was studying literature in Rome, it was my custom to visit on Sundays, with some companions of my own age and tastes, the tombs of the martyrs and apostles. I often wandered into those subterranean galleries whose walls on either side preserve the relics of the dead, and where the darkness is so intense that one might almost believe that the words of the prophet had been fulfilled: 'Let them go down alive into hell.' A gleam of light shining through a narrow aperture, rather than a window, scarcely affected the awful obscurity, and the little band, shrouded in darkness and able only to proceed one step at a time, would recall this verse of Virgil's 'Everywhere horror and even the very silence appal me.' " [Comment, in Ezech., lib. XII., CXL.]

In his youth Jerome witnessed the attempts made by Julian to restore paganism, and he saw also the utter failure

in which they resulted. "While I was attending the schools of the grammarians," he wrote, "when every town was stained with the blood of idolatrous sacrifices, suddenly at the very height of the persecution Julian's death was announced to us. 'How,' exclaimed a pagan, and not unreasonably, 'do the Christians say that theirs is a patient and a merciful God? There is nothing more terrible, nothing more swift than His wrath. He could not even for an instant defer His vengeance.'" [Comment in Habacuc. Lib. II. cap. III.]

The faith which had so early been instilled into Jerome and which was so precious to him, did not, however, shield him from the seductions of Rome, but unlike Augustine, who wrote the humble confession of his protracted sins, he only alludes to his in passing. "You know," he wrote Chromatius, "how slippery are those pathways of youth where I succumbed." In a letter to Heliodorus, whom he wished to take with him into the desert, and whom he rebuked for his delay, he was more explicit: "Why linger in the world, thou who hast already chosen solitude? If I give thee this advice it is not as if my ship and my cargo were undamaged, not as if I were ignorant of the deep, but rather as one shipwrecked and just cast up upon the shore, in feeble tones I warn the navigators of their peril." [Epist. XIV. ad Heliodorum, 6.]

There is another difference between Augustine and Jerome worthy of notice. It is evident that after the supreme struggles of which Augustine has given us a dramatic account he experienced no further aggression of the vanquished foe. The luring voices which made one final effort to woo him to excess were silenced, and no doubt remained so forever, for after his conversion Augustine seems to have inhabited serene heights inaccessible to any disturbing memories of the past; but Jerome, who was by nature more ardent and perhaps less gentle than the son of Monica, could not forget so quickly. Beguiling visions followed him to the desert of Chalcis, and he succeeded in exorcising them only through ceaseless work and penances.

From Rome the young Dalmatian, with Bonosus, passed into Gaul and repaired to Trèves, where Valentinian I. then

resided, and it was in Gaul that Jerome determined to renounce the world which had so wounded him and devote himself to the service of Jesus Christ. He accordingly returned to Rome and was baptized there by Liberius. This Pope having died on the twenty-fourth of September 366, Jerome's baptism could not have taken place at a later date. Leaving Rome he started for Aquileia, where religious studies and monastic discipline flourished, and which was at that time an important town and the capital of its native province.

His stay at Aquileia was only the first halt in a life of travel. From that time forth trials beset him. "He was already beginning," says Tillemont, "to make enemies whose persecutions were sufficiently violent to oblige him to move from place to place, and serious enough to reach the ears of the Pope Damasus." [Memoirs, etc., St. Jerome. Article IV.] One of his adversaries was the Bishop Lupicinus. Finally he determined to go to the East and, following Baroni-^{us} example, before leaving the Western Hemisphere he paid a visit to his native town and there bade farewell to his own people forever. He did not attempt to conceal the painful effort the breaking of these family ties cost him. "Whenever the impress of your familiar hands recalls your dear faces to me, then am I no longer where I am, or rather you are there with me." [Epist. VII. ad Chromatium Jovinum et Eusebium.] The man who sent such a message, a message perhaps more touching than well expressed, to those from whom he was separated, the man who appreciated so keenly the bonds of friendship, was certainly not insensible to those of blood. "Full do I know," he wrote to Heliodorus, "what fetters hold thee back. My heart is not of stone nor my bowels of iron, I was not begotten by rocks nor suckled by the tigresses of Hyrcania; I also have gone through the anguish which thou darest." [Epist. XIV. ad Heliodorum, 3.] Jerome probably had as travelling companions this same Heliodorus, and also Innocentius and Hylas, whom we again meet at his side in the East when, as Tillemont, who translated the works of the Saints, tells: "He set out carrying with him the library he had collected in Rome, travelled over many provinces, passed through

Thrace, Pontus and Bithynia, crossed the whole of Galatia and Cappadocia, suffered the intolerable heat of Cilicia . . . and finally in Syria found the peace which he sought as a safe harbor after shipwreck."

Before retiring into the desert, however, he spent a few days at Antioch with Evagrius, a priest of that city, whom Jerome had known in Italy, whither he had gone to lay the discords in his Church before the Western bishops, and who on his return became the guide and sponsor of Jerome and his companions in Antioch.

Jerome, inflamed with an ardor for study which never cooled, wished to hear the men most learned in the Scriptures, and especially Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, who at that period had not yet fallen into his later notorious heresy. It was probably about this time that Jerome knew the hermit Malchus, but it was not until long after that he related his wonderful history, which Lafontaine has translated into graceful verse.

Jerome, however, had left Aquileia, not for Antioch, but bound for the wilderness. He plunged into the heart of the desert of Chalcis, where, under burning skies and amid vast tracts of sand out of which sprang here and there a few scattered convents, he had gone to seek repentance, and where he found fresh sorrows awaiting him. Heliodorus returned to the West, and Jerome's friendship for Innocent and Hylas was ruthlessly severed by their death. But the memories of his libertine youth, which troubled the peace of his soul and threatened to sully a chastity so dearly bought, caused him a still keener grief than the loss of his friends, and he has left us a description of his anguish, of his almost desperate but finally victorious struggles, in pages of striking eloquence and immortal beauty. "How often," he wrote, "buried in this vast wilderness, scorched by the rays of the sun, have I imagined myself in the midst of the pleasures of Rome. I sat alone because my heart was filled with exceeding bitterness. My limbs were covered with unsightly sackcloth, and my blackened skin gave me the appearance of an Ethiopian. I wept and groaned daily, and if in spite of my struggle sleep overcame me, the bones in my emaciated body, which sank

to the naked earth, barely clave together. I do not mention my nourishment or drink, for in this desert even the sick monks scarcely dare touch fresh water, and to eat cooked food would be considered an excess. And I, who, through the fear of hell, had condemned myself to this prison inhabited by scorpions and serpents, imagined myself transported into the midst of the dances of the young Roman maidens. My face was pallid with fasting, my body cold as ice, yet my soul burned with sensual emotion and in flesh already dead only the fire of the passions was still capable of kindling. Debarred from all help I threw myself at the feet of Jesus, watered them with my tears, wiped them with my hair, and strove to subdue my rebellious flesh by weeks of abstinence. I do not blush to own to my misery, rather do I weep that I am no longer as I once was. I remember having often spent the entire day and night in crying aloud and in beating my breast, until, at the command of God, who rules the tempest, peace crept back into my soul. I even dreaded my cell as if it had been an accomplice to my thoughts. Angry with myself I penetrated alone further into the desert, and if I discovered any dark valley, any rugged mountain, any rock of difficult access, it was the spot I fixed upon to pray in, and to make into a prison for my wretched body. God is witness that sometimes, after having long fixed my eyes upon heaven and after copious weeping, I believed myself transported among the choir of angels. Then in a trusting and joyful ecstasy I sang unto the Lord: 'We pursue Thee by the scent of Thy perfumes.' " [Epist. XXII. ad Eustochium, 7.]

In order to subdue his flesh and curb his imagination, Jerome had recourse to other means besides corporal punishment. "When I was young," he wrote, "although buried in the desert, I could not conquer my burning passions and ardent nature, and in spite of my body being exhausted by perpetual fasts my brain was on fire with evil thoughts. Finally, as a last resource, I put myself under the tutelage of a certain monk, a Jew who had become a Christian, and, forsaking the ingenious precepts of Quintilian, the floods of eloquence poured forth by Cicero, the grave utterances of Fronto, and the tender words of Pliny, I began to learn the

Hebrew alphabet, and to study this language of hissing and harsh-sounding words. I who have suffered so much, and with me those who at that time shared my life, can alone testify to the efforts I wasted, the difficulties I went through, and how often I despairingly interrupted my studies, which a dogged determination to learn made me afterwards resume; and I give thanks unto God that from such a bitter sowing I am now able to gather such sweet fruit." [Epist. CXXV. ad Rusticum monachum, 12.]

It was probably at this period, that is in 374, that the mysterious dream of which Jerome has left us a dramatic account came to him. Imbued with the works of classic antiquity, he cherished a love for them. "Miserable wretch," he wrote, "I fasted before reading Cicero; after nights spent in vigil, after tears wrung from me by the memory of my sins, I would take up Plautus, and when, on coming to my senses, I read the Prophets, their speech seemed to me uncouth and unfinished. Blind, I blamed the light instead of condemning my own eyes." A vision cured him, for a while at least, of this passion. "Towards the middle of Lent (probably the Lent of 375), while Satan was thus mocking me, I was seized with a fever which, finding my body exhausted by want of rest, consumed it to such an extent that my bones barely clave together. My body was becoming cold, a faint remnant of warmth however still enabled my heart to beat. They were preparing my funeral obsequies, when suddenly my soul was caught up from me and carried before the Tribunal of the Supreme Judge. The light was so dazzling, those who surrounded Him shed such a blaze of splendor, that, falling back upon the ground, I dared not gaze aloft. They asked me who I was and I answered a Christian. 'Thou liest,' said the Judge, 'thou are a Ciceronian and not a Christian, for where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also.' I was silent; and whilst the blows rained down upon me, for the Judge had commanded that I should be scourged, suffering even more from the torment of my bitter remorse, I repeated to myself this verse on the Psalms: 'Who will render thee glory in hell?' Then I cried out weeping: 'Have pity on me, Lord, have pity.' This cry rang

out in the midst of the blows, and at last those who were present, throwing themselves at the feet of the Judge, entreated Him to have mercy upon my youth, to grant me time to work out my repentance, and to punish me severely if I should again peruse a pagan book. I, who, to escape from the terrible straits in which I found myself would have promised far more, swore to Him and said, calling His name to witness: 'Lord, if hereafter I harbor or read any secular books, may I be treated as if I had renounced Thee.' After this oath I was released and I returned to earth. Those present were astonished to see me reopen my eyes, which were bathed in such a flood of tears that my grief convinced the most sceptical. That it was not one of those vain dreams by which we are deceived, I attest the Tribunal before which I lay prostrate and the sentence which so appalled me. Please God that I may never again be submitted to such an ordeal. When I awoke my shoulders were bruised and I could still feel the blows. From that moment I studied religious books with far more ardor than I had ever read profane ones." [Epist. XXII. ad Eustochium, 30.]

Did Jerome abide by this oath throughout his life? Although making allowances for the saint's vigorous memory, to which reminiscences of Terence, Lucretius, Cicero, Virgil and Seneca were continually recurring (Augustine, at Hippo, preserved the memory of his classical education in the same tenacious manner), we have reason to believe that Jerome more than once opened the works of these pagan authors whom he had renounced. To Rufinus, whose insidious hatred accused him of the crime of perjury, he replied that the keeping of a promise made in a dream could not be exacted of him. However, even if Jerome did not deem himself irrevocably bound by his pledge, he applied himself more and more to the study of the Bible, and his classical reading and recollections were exclusively devoted to defending and embellishing the truth. This is what he pointed out in a celebrated letter to Magnus, the orator, in which, with skilful and weighty arguments he cited the example of all his predecessors, reminding him that according to Deuteronomy the Israelite must needs cut the nails and hair of his slave

before marrying her. "Is it astonishing that profane literature should have seduced me by the grace of its language and by the beauty of its form, or that I should wish to convert a slave and a captive into a daughter of Israel? If I come across anything dead, any passage breathing idolatry, sensuality, error, or evil passions, I suppress it, and from my alliance with a stainless spouse are born servants of the true God; thus do I increase the family of Christ." [Epist. LXX. ad Magnum, oratorem urbis Romæ, 2.]

The questions of discipline and dogma which were agitating the Church of Antioch, disturbed Jerome afresh in his retreat. Four bishops were contending for the Patriarchal See of the East. In 361, after the death of Eustathius, the intrepid champion of the Nicene faith, the Arians and many Catholics had agreed to elect Meletius of Sebaste, whose orthodoxy, already attested at the time of Constantine's persecution, asserted itself at Antioch from the very first, with the result of alienating the Arians, who chose Euzoïus as their leader. Those Catholics, however, who were most devoted to Eustathius' glorious memory, refused to give their support to a bishop who had counted Arians among his electors. Towards the end of 379 Lucifer of Cagliari, on his return from the exile to which he had been banished by the son of Constantine, appointed the priest Paulinus, who was recognized by Alexandria and the West, as Bishop to the *Eustathians*. At the beginning of 376, to support his heresy in introducing the Bishop of Laodicea into Antioch, Apollinaris had the audacity to assign the government of this great Church to his disciple Vitalis, whom he had consecrated. Quite outside of all this, the inhabitants of Antioch and of the monasteries at Chalcis were discussing whether they should recognize in God three hypostases or three persons. In the theological language of to-day the two terms are synonymous, but in the fourth century they were not considered so by all. At Antioch the Meletians preferred the term hypostasis to that of person, as being more explicit against the heresy of Sabellius; the partisans of Paulinus, on the other hand, conforming themselves to the Latin custom which understood hypostasis and substance to be synonym-

ous, considered it an Arian impiety to say that in God there were three hypostases. Urged by the monks amongst whom he lived to pronounce upon the legitimate vicar and the orthodox expression, Jerome addressed himself in two famous letters to Pope Damasus. Certainly these letters are sufficient proof that he disliked the word hypostasis, which seemed to him equivocal or erroneous. Meletius too, the champion of this word, was especially displeasing to him, and his sympathies were entirely drawn towards Paulinus, the patriarch favored by Latin Christianity. Upon these points he asked the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, which he valued above everything, and to which he was willing to submit. "I thought," he wrote, Damasus, "that I ought to consult the Apostolic See and the Roman Faith which St. Paul the Apostle extolled. I crave spiritual nourishment from the Church where I received the baptismal robe. . . . You are the light of the world, the salt of the earth, in your possession are the vessels of silver and gold, elsewhere are the vessels of clay and of wood destined for the iron rod which shall shatter them, and for the eternal fires which shall consume them."

In terms which succeeding centuries have freely quoted Jerome proclaimed the Roman pre-eminence and the obligation imposed upon all to conform to it. "I know that on that stone the Church was built; he who eats of the Paschal Lamb outside of its walls is an impious man. He who has not sought refuge in the Ark of Noah will be overtaken by the deluge." He then asked Damasus to inform him which vicar he was to follow and which term he was to employ. "I do not know Vitalis, I repudiate Meletius, I ignore Paulinus. Whoever reaps not with thee, scatters; whoever belongs not to Christ belongs to Antichrist." It is evident that Jerome could not accept the term hypostasis with enthusiasm; he declares as much in bitter, almost haughty tone; nevertheless he was willing to accept it should Damasus pronounce its usage to be legitimate. "I pray you decide this matter for me, and I will not shrink from saying that there are three hypostases in God. . . . I implore your Holiness by the crucified Lord, by the consubstantial Trinity,

to write and authorize me either to suppress or use this word." [Epist. XV. ad Damasum papam.]

Jerome left Chalcis, probably driven from the desert by some foolish persecution, and joined Evagrius in Antioch, where Paulinus compelled him to enter the priesthood; but so strong was his love of solitude, so jealous was he of his liberty that he stipulated that his ordination should not bind him to any one particular church. By a peculiarity which the Jansenists willingly proposed as a model, Jerome never ascended to the altar. In virtue of this liberty which was justly dear to him, he contended, in a dialogue written at Antioch, against the heterodox rigorism of Lucifer of Cagliari, the bishop who had consecrated his friend Paulinus.

Towards 380 we meet the indefatigable traveller at Constantinople, where St. Gregory of Nazianzus, placed against his will upon the episcopal throne of that town, was re-establishing the true faith in the hearts of a people who for forty years had been given over to Arianism, and with poetic and touching eloquence was distributing the treasures of his irreproachable doctrine among them. It was to the tuition of such a master that Jerome submitted himself, and in after years he took pleasure in evoking his reminiscences of him, and in repeating his lessons.

In 381, Jerome left Constantinople and passing through Greece came to Rome.

Jerome arrived in Rome accompanied by two Eastern bishops, Paulinus to whom he adhered, and Epiphanius of Salamis. Important work, illustrious friendships, struggles, and also bitter trials, awaited him in the capital of the Christian world. At the Council which Damasus convoked Jerome gave evidence of his erudition and of the soundness of his doctrine in defending, with the authority of St. Athanasius a name ascribed to Christ (*homo dominicus*), the orthodoxy of which was contested by the Apollinarists. The Pope, impressed by the talent he was well fitted to appreciate, made Jerome his secretary, empowered him to reply in his name to the inquiries of the Synods, and often referred to the wisdom of the learned exegete on his own account. Further, Damasus forcibly influenced the whole

life of his collaborator. Pope Damasus had seen Jerome's tendency to omnivorous reading, and he roused him from this beguiling torpor by urging him to useful work. At his request Jerome translated two of Origen's Homilies on the Song of Solomon, and began to translate the treatise upon the Holy Ghost by Didymus, the blind sage of Alexandria. Was it St. Ambrose's work on the same subject which Jerome criticized in such severe terms in his Preface? ("Nihil ibi dialecticum, nihil virile atque districtum . . . sed totum flaccidum, molle. . .") Rufinus in his *Invectives* pretended that it was, but the Benedictines who edited the Bishop of Milan's work, disputed this assertion, which Tillemont, however, seems inclined to believe. [*Memoirs, etc.*, St. Ambrose, note XI.] From the pen of such a censor as Jerome the harshest criticisms are by no means surprising, and this was especially a criticism of a literary order.

Damasus exacted a task of still greater importance from Jerome. The Gospel had at an early date been translated into Latin for the benefit of Western Christianity, but the primitive version, the ancient *Itala*, had suffered in the manuscripts in circulation corrections and also innumerable alterations and additions. Moreover, through the need of a concordance, in order to make the copy already owned as complete as possible, the various narratives of the Evangelists were frequently united in a single text. Alarmed at the danger introduced by these divergencies, Damasus entreated Jerome to revise the New Testament according to the original Greek. Jerome, who was by nature intolerant of contradiction, had no illusions as to the criticism to which this task would expose him. He was about to disturb old ways of thought, and possibly startle timid consciences; nevertheless, strong in the support afforded him by the Pope, he began and successfully terminated the work demanded of him, suppressed the interpolations, re-established the inverted sequence of the sacred text, and presented this meritorious achievement to Damasus, having added to it the ten canons or tables of concordance translated from Greek into Latin, in which Eusebius of Cæsarea, and also Ammonius of Alexandria, had shown what was special to each Evangelist and what was common to all four.

Jerome undertook another revision, that of the Psalter. The translation current in the Latin Church had been made from the Greek text of the Septuagint, but owing to the numerous alterations which had crept into the manuscript copies, it was incorrect in many places. From the Hieronymian revision sprang the *Psalterium Romanum*, which was in use in Rome up to the reign of St. Pius V., and to which the *Venite Exultemus* in the Invitatory and the passages of the Psalms cited in the missal still belong. "This first work was in its turn soon altered by the copyists, and at the urgent desire of St. Paula, Jerome decided to make a second revision, which this time he based upon Origen's *Hexapla*. This was the *Psalterium Gallicanum* (anno 389), so called because it was first adopted in Gaul. . . . The Gallican Psalter is the one inserted in our Vulgate and used in our Breviary." Somewhat later, about 392, he translated the Psalms from the Hebrew.

These works, and the austerity of Jerome's life while accomplishing them, drew much attention upon the secretary of Pope Damasus, and won him many illustrious and priceless friendships.

In a palace on the Aventine, some noble-hearted women of earnest faith, gathered together and confronted the paganism which was still general, and the immorality of an all too large number of Christians, with the humble and courageous exhibition of their virtue. The mistress of this noble dwelling was Marcella, who had consecrated her premature and irrevocable widowhood to God, to the poor, and to the study of holy works. With her were also her mother, Albina, Asella, whose meekness was extolled by Palladius the historian of St. John Chrysostom; Furia, the heiress of the Camilli, Fabiola, who, although less strong in righteousness than her pious comrades, eventually atoned for the sins of her youth by penance and charity, Lea, the widow and Principia.

We must especially mention three women who were more cherished by Jerome than all the others, and whose names are closely linked with his in history, namely Paula and two of her daughters, Blesilla and Eustochium.

It is unnecessary here to give an account of Paula's early history. By her mother she was authentically connected with the Scipios and the Gracchi, and her father, Rogatus, a wealthy proprietor of Nicopolis, claimed descent from Agamemnon, the king of kings. At the age of thirty-five, after the death of her husband, Julius Toxotius, a reputed descendant of Æneas, for in the genealogy of patrician Rome legend blends easily with history, Paula was inspired by Marcella's example to adopt the ascetic life, in which she soon equalled her heroic friend. Her eldest daughter, Blesilla, left a widow after seven months of marriage, re-entered the narrow path from which the world had momentarily tempted her, and died in the flower of her youth, lamented in pathetic accents by Jerome.

Eustochium, another of Paula's daughters, was reserved for a longer career than Blesilla, the tenderly-mourned. She followed her mother to the East, where she succeeded her in the direction of the convents in Palestine, and, always calm, always invincible to temptation, she retained Jerome as consoler and guide until the end.

The love of the Scriptures glowed in the hearts of these Christian women who, in order to acquire a deeper knowledge of the holy books, resolutely began the study of Greek and Hebrew. In these researches, where the knowledge of truth and not the elusive joys of vainglory were sought, they were directed by Jerome; and Marcella, whose guest he had become, outstripped all her companions in this arduous pursuit. Later on, the recluse of Bethlehem, in his "Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians," wrote of her: "Whenever I picture to myself her ardor for study, her vivacity of mind and her application, I blame my idleness, I who, retreated in this wilderness, with the manger whither the shepherds came in haste to adore the wailing Christ-child constantly before mine eyes, am unable to accomplish what a noble woman accomplishes in the hour she snatches from the cares of a large circle and the government of her household."

Jerome was reproached for teaching only women. He answered what too often, alas, the priest of the present day

would have the right to reply: "If men questioned me more about the Scriptures I would speak less to women." He added: "I rejoice, I am filled with enthusiasm, when in Babylon I meet Daniel, Ananias, Azarias, and Misael." [Epist. LXV. ad Principiam virginem, 2.] He found Daniel, Ananias, Azarias, and Misael in a few chosen friends who frequented the Aventine and attended the religious school. They were Pammachius, Marcella's cousin, who was to marry Paulina, Paula's second daughter; Oceanus, a learned man who later visited Jerome at Bethlehem; Marcellinus, who in Africa, in the time of Augustine, was the most conscientious of magistrates; and Domnion, a priest advanced in years, the praises of whose charity were sung by all.

In spite of the austere sweetness of these friendships, in spite of the substantial support which the protection of Damasus secured for him, Jerome did not taste peace in Rome. Was peace, however, what he sought? Jerome surely did not shrink from contention. He had defended the incomparable benefits of perfect chastity against Helvidius, a contemner of the dogma of the perpetual virginity of Mary, and, without denying the legitimacy of marriage, he pointed out its drawbacks, I was about to say its evils. He encouraged young girls, for whom honorable or brilliant marriages were in contemplation, in their desire to lead a monastic life, and at the sight of the Roman virgins who, through his advice, thus renounced their families, there were many who would readily have accused him of murder, more especially after the death of Blesilla, whom he was reported to have killed by dint of the fasts he imposed upon her. That was not the only grudge harbored against him. He denounced with eloquent indignation and inexhaustible fervor the licentiousness, avarice, intemperance and hypocrisy which had crept in among the priests and the monks at Rome and it may easily be imagined that those stung by his powerful satire, and those who recognized themselves or were recognized by others in his portraits, became incensed, and that anger and resentment broke out against him on every side. Calumny soon came to the aid of spite, and at the expense of all justice as well as truth the relations between

Paula and her spiritual director were incriminated. The death of Damasus, which took place on the 11th of December 384, deprived Jerome of his protector, excluded him from the Apostolic Chancery, and completed his severance from Rome. His thoughts turned once more to the desert, but this time it was the Biblical desert in which he wished permanently to establish himself, and he left Rome forever, taking with him his brother Paulinian, the priest Vincent, and a few monks. From Ostia, on the point of embarking, he wrote a letter to Asella, in which his affectionate and saddened soul reveals itself. "If I believed myself capable of thanking thee worthily," he wrote, "I should be incensed. But God can reward thy saintly soul for me for the good thou has done me. As to me, I am unworthy of it, and I never had any right to hope or even to wish that thou wouldst grant me in Jesus Christ so great an affection. And even if certain persons believe me to be a vile wretch overwhelmed by the weight of my sins—in comparison to my sins that is but little—yet thou art right in letting thy heart distinguish for thee between the righteous and the unrighteous. . . ." Jerome then proceeded to exonerate himself from the calumnies which had assailed him and invoked the memory and testimony of Asella and of all those who lived on the Aventine. "Many a time have I been surrounded by a flock of virgins, and to the best of my ability expounded the divine books to several of them. Study creates assiduity, assiduity familiarity, and familiarity a mutual understanding. Call upon those virgins to answer if they have ever had any thought from me other than those one should receive from a Christian. Have I ever taken money from any of them? Have I not always repulsed every gift large or small? Has my neighbor's lucre ever soiled my hand? Have I ever uttered a dubious word or cast too bold a glance?"

Jerome journeyed to Rhegium thence to Cyprus, and thence to Antioch; St. Paula leaving Rome forever joined him here. She brought with her her daughter Eustochium and a band of Roman virgins who had consecrated themselves to God. In the middle of winter St. Jerome and St. Paula and her companions set out for the Holy Land.

In praef. 2 ad Paralip. he describes the finis of this journey: "As those who have seen Athens better understand Grecian history; and as he, who has traveled from Troas through Leucadia and the Acroceraunian mountains to Sicily, and thence to the mouth of the Tiber, will better understand the third book of Virgil, thus a man will more clearly understand the Scriptures, if he shall have seen Judæa with his own eyes, and shall have examined the memorials of the old cities, and the names of places whether unchanged or changed. Hence we took the pains to undergo this labor with most learned Hebrews, that we might journey through the country of which all the churches of Christ speak. Coming to Cæsarea, Jerome came upon the Hexapla of Origen, and from this copied all the books of the Old Testament. He descended into Egypt and listened at Alexandria to Didymus, the celebrated teacher of Scripture: "My head was now sprinkled with gray hairs," he says, "and seemed more fit for the master than the disciple; but I went to Alexandria, I heard Didymus, and for many things, am thankful to him."

Jerome now returned to Palestine and established himself at Bethlehem, where, out of the wreck of his inheritance, consisting of farms partially destroyed by the barbarians, which Paulinian was commissioned to sell, and with the aid of Paula's bounty, he erected a monastery which he fortified with a tower of refuge. He selected for his cell a cave close to the one where our Lord was born. Paula, meanwhile, after having built some temporary cells, was engaged in constructing convents, and her indefatigable charity endowed as a hospice for pilgrims the hamlet where, as Jerome observed, Mary and Joseph had been without shelter.

In Palestine Jerome was once more thrown with Rufinus, a friend of his youth, who had left Rome in 371 and after six years spent in Egypt had settled at Jerusalem not far from the widow Melania, celebrated for her austere sacrifices and her continual journeys. The intimacy which absence had interrupted without destroying, was renewed between the two friends. Jerome used even to have the manuscripts of secular literature needed for his disciples copied by monks

belonging to the convent of the Olive Trees, which Rufinus directed.

The early days of Jerome's sojourn in Bethlehem were most serene; everything charmed and satisfied him, and a tremor of joyous admiration, a breath of spring, one might almost say, seems to vibrate through the pages which he wrote or inspired during that period. "The most illustrious Gauls congregate here, and no sooner has the Briton, so remote from our world, made any progress in piety, than he abandons his early setting sun to seek a land which he knows only by reputation, and through the Scriptures. And what of the Armenians, the Persians, the nations of India and Ethiopia; of Egypt herself, so rich in monks, of Pontus, Cappadocia, Coelesyria and Mesopotamia? All these Eastern countries send us hordes of monks . . . they throng here and set us the example of every virtue. The languages differ, but the religion is the same, and one can count as many different choirs singing the psalms as there are nations. Yet in all this—and this is the triumph of Christianity—there is no vainglory, none prides himself upon his chastity; if they quarrel it is as to who shall be the humblest, for the last is here counted first. . . They do not judge one another, for fear of being judged by the Saviour, and slander, so prevalent in many districts where they malign each other outrageously, is here completely unknown. Here is no luxury, no sensuality. . . ." Either Jerome or Paula closes this description with a few lines of idyllic grace. "In this land of Christ's all is simplicity, and except when the Psalms are being sung all is silence. Wherever you may go you hear the laborer, with his hand upon the plough, murmuring Alleluia. The reaper, with the sweat pouring from his brow, finds relaxation in singing the Psalms, and the vintager recites some passage from David while pruning his vines. They are, so to speak, the love songs of the country; the shepherds' lilt, the laborers' accompaniment." [Epist. XLVI.—Paulæ et Eustochii ad Marcellam, 9, 10, 11.]

These peaceful years were also years of toil for Jerome. The direction of the convents which had sprung up about the cave of Bethlehem, the active correspondence he main-

tained with his friends in the outer world, even the grammatical instruction he gave to the young men, which brought back to him those secular works of antiquity he had vainly striven to hate or to forget, would have been sufficient in themselves to fill his life. They were, however, but a minor portion of his work. He had undertaken the study of the Scriptures at the advice of Damasus, but the Providential attraction which also drew him to them, was continually stronger and surer. Everything seemed to lead him to the Bible.

Sulpicius Severus, who spent six months with him at Bethlehem, thus describes his life: "He is wholly absorbed in reading, he takes no rest by day or by night; he is ever reading or writing something." Jerome was a man of great physical endurance. His literary activity at Bethlehem may be compared to that of Origen. He translated the book of Tobias in a single night, and even, when ill, he dictated from his couch to an amanuensis.

To perfect his knowledge of Hebrew, he employed a Jew to teach him, and, as this preceptor feared the fanaticism of his race, the lessons were given by night. Jerome speaks of these things in his *Epist. ad Pammachius*, 84, 3: "With most great labor, and great price did I have Baranina by night as preceptor. He feared the Jews, and was to me another Nicodemus." Coupled with this, he assiduously studied the Fathers and writers of the Church. Villarsi declares that no one, Greek or Latin, read more authors than Jerome. In the year 389 Jerome began the great work of his life, a translation of the protocanonical books of the Old Testament from the original Hebrew. He was not able to devote all his time to the great work, but it was the chief object of his labors for fifteen years. He also translated the deuterocanonical books of Tobias and Judith from Chaldean exemplars. This translation of Jerome forms our Vulgate, concerning which we shall speak later. His translation of the Psalter from the Hebrew was not received into the Vulgate; its place was occupied by the Psalter which he revised from the Hexaplar text of Origen at Cæsarea.

A long and painful ordeal was about to disturb what St. Augustine called "the peaceful joy" which Jerome tasted in his work. It arose from the most unexpected quarter, his adversary being no other than Rufinus, with whom he engaged in a fratricidal conflict over the writings of Origen.

Jerome had first met Rufinus at Aquileia, and they had contracted one of those friendships which seem eternal. It was to this friend of his youth, who had left him to visit the Egyptian Thebaides, that Jerome, isolated in the desert of Chalcis, wrote from a bed of sickness: "Oh! if the Lord Jesus Christ would grant that I might suddenly be transported to thy side as was Philip to the minister of Candacia, and Habakkuk to Daniel, how tenderly would I clasp thee in my arms!" He closed this letter with the following words, which subsequent events so cruelly belied: "I beseech thee, let not thy heart lose sight, as have thine eyes, of a friend so long sought, with such difficulty found, and so hard to retain! Let others gloat over their gold! Friendship is an incomparable possession, a priceless treasure, but the friendship which can perish has never been a true one." [Epist. III. ad Rufinum monachum.]

This last is a somewhat bold assertion, and one which fails to take into account the inconstancy of the human heart which is liable to take back what it once gave in all sincerity. St. Augustine, who was the most devoted and faithful of friends, the mere mention of whose name recalls those of so many beings dear to him whose lives were inseparably interwoven with his own, in speaking of this rupture between Rufinus and Jerome has deplored in touching accents the frailty which undermines or menaces our affections. "What hearts will hereafter dare open themselves to one another; is there any friend to whom one may freely unbosom oneself; where is the friend one does not fear some day to count an enemy, if this rupture which we deplore could have taken place between Jerome and Rufinus? Oh! wretched plight of mankind, and worthy of pity! How can we put faith in what we see in our friend's souls when we cannot foresee what may change them? Yet why lament thus over others when we do not know what we may be ourselves? Man

barely and imperfectly knows what he is to-day; he has no conception of what he may be to-morrow." [Epist. CX. inter Epist. Hieronymi, 6.]

A famous writing of Origen's gave rise to a stormy quarrel and an irrevocable rupture between the two friends. It was curious that the timid writer, who took exception to the most legitimate of Jerome's innovations and behind whose watchful orthodoxy lurked a conservative and moody spirit of distrust, should have been the champion of the brilliant and audacious Alexandrian, who seems to us one of the most dazzling and in certain respects one of the most sympathetic personalities of the Christian school of Alexandria.

Jerome had proclaimed Origen the master of the Churches after the apostles. But he tells us that he praised Origen as an interpreter, not as a dogmatist. [Epist. LXXXIV ad Pam.] This is an awkward apology. A false dogmatist can not be a good interpreter. The fact of the matter seems to be that Jerome himself was deceived by the views of Origen. The vehemence and intolerance of Jerome's nature can be gleaned from the following passage, Epist. XXXIII. 4. It was written concerning the condemnation of Origen: "Rome consents to his condemnation; it brings together its senate against him, not because of the novelty of his doctrines, not because of heresy, as the *dogs who are mad against him* now pretend, but because they could not bear the glory of his eloquence and his knowledge, and because when he spoke they were made to appear as mutes."

A few years later he abused Rufinus in a similar manner because he sustained the defense of Origen. Like violent changes of opinion characterize his whole life. His judgments are not uniform and consistent, and this is to be taken into account when adducing him as an authority.

Rufinus died in Sicily in 410, and Jerome thus speaks of his death in the opening chapter of his Commentary on Ezechiel: "The scorpion lies underground between Enceladus and Porphyryon, and the hydra of many heads has at last ceased to hiss against me." "Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ?"

Rufinus also was a bitter foe. Anyone who has read his Apology, his "Invectives against Jerome," for such is the name which has clung to this work, will be fully persuaded of this. "He devoted three years to this work," says Amédée Thierry, "which appeared fragment by fragment; he divided it into two books to which he later added a supplement. He had a double aim, first to exonerate himself from the crime of heresy by casting upon Jerome the accusation directed towards himself, and then to dishonor Jerome and to throw odium on his name by personal imputations, lamenting the while being forced to such measures." [St. Jerome, Lib. IV.] Indeed no pamphlet has ever been composed with more cunning hatred, nor has ever struck the adversary more surely. According to him, Jerome was the enemy of mankind; a traducer of the faithful, whose customs he had calumniated in his book upon Virginity, at the risk of justifying and even magnifying the calumnies of the pagans; a traducer of the works of Ambrose the great bishop; a traducer of Rome, the capital of the Christian world; and a traducer of all authors, either Greek or Latin, who had preceded him. One grievance which Rufinus put forward with malignant insistence, was the important part the pagan authors played in Jerome's works and in his thoughts. In vain had Jerome after a famous vision sworn never to reopen any secular book. "Peruse his writings and see if there is a single page which does not point to his having again become a Ciceronian, and in which he does not speak of 'Our Cicero,' 'Our Homer,' 'Our Virgil'; he even boasts of having read the works of Pythagoras, which according to the erudite are no longer in existence. In almost all his works quotations from secular authors are far more numerous and lengthy than those from the Prophets and Apostles. Even when writing to women or maidens, who in our holy books seek only subjects for edification, he intersperses his letters with quotations from Horace, Cicero or Virgil." [Rufinus Apol. Lib. sec. 7.]

A controversy arose between St. Jerome and St. Augustine between the years 395 and 405. The origin of the controversy was St. Jerome's commentary of Galatians II. 11—14.

"I have read," Augustine wrote Jerome, "a commentary upon the Epistles of St. Paul which is ascribed to you, and I came across the passage in the Epistle to the Galatians, where the Apostle Peter is reproved for the deception into which he had been drawn. I confess with no small sorrow that in it you, even you, or the author of this writing whosoever he may be, have defended the cause of untruth. I consider it a fatal error to believe it possible to find anything in the Scriptures which is untrue, in other words, to believe that the men to whom we are indebted for the sacred works could have inserted therein any falsehood. Once admit any officious untruth in the Holy books, then, in accordance with this pernicious principle, in order to escape from a moral which imposes too much restraint upon us, or from dogmas which are beyond our comprehension, we may attribute any part of these works to the artifice of an author who has not told the truth." Having pursued his urgent argument pointed by illustrations from the Bible, Augustine, scarcely hoping that his request would be acceded to, demanded an explanation which would dispel his doubts. In conclusion he claimed a fraternally severe criticism of which he had just given an example, for those of his works which Profuturus was to offer to Jerome.

Meanwhile Profuturus, who had been made Bishop of Cirta in Numidia, instead of starting for Palestine took possession of his see, where he very shortly died. The letter, therefore, which had been given to him never reached its destination, but unfortunately fell into indiscreet hands, and the copies of it which were circulated in Dalmatia and Italy, encouraged Jerome's enemies in their criticisms. Augustine had also been raised to the episcopacy in 395, and amid new cares and duties had no doubt forgotten not only his letter, but the commentary which had provoked it, when a note which the deacon Presidius brought him from Jerome, recalled them to his mind. As Jerome's missive did not in any way answer the questions Augustine had put to him, the latter thinking that his letter had gone astray wrote another, which was longer but not less peremptory and no less aggressive. After having again tried to demonstrate

the dangers of the Hieronymian explanation, Augustine exhorted the aged historian to a courageous retraction of it, reminding him of the fable of Stesichorus who, struck with blindness by the demi-gods Castor and Pollux for having decried the chastity and beauty of Helen in a satire, did not recover his sight until he had sung the praises of the grace and virtue he had outraged, upon his lyre.

"I implore you," he wrote Jerome, "gird yourself with a sincere and Christian severity, correct and amend your work, and so to speak sing its recantation. The truth of Christians is incomparably more beautiful than the Helen of the Greeks, for it indeed, have our martyrs fought more bravely against the Sodom of their century, than did the Greek heroes against Troy. I do not urge you to this disavowal, so that you may recover your mental sight, for God forbid that I should think that you had lost it, yet suffer me to tell you that through I know not what inadvertency you have turned aside your eyes, sound and far-sighted though they may be, and have failed to see the disastrous consequences of a system which would admit that one of the authors of our sacred books, could once, in some part of his work, have conscientiously and piously lied." [Epist. LXVII. Augustini ad Hieronymum, inter Epistolas Hieronymi, 7.]

The man, by name Paul, to whom this letter had been confided, overcome by his terror of the sea, did not embark for Palestine, and another messenger chosen by Augustine also failed to deliver the missive to Jerome. The letter, however, spread abroad, and with it a report that Augustine had composed and sent to Rome a book against Jerome. The deacon Sisinius, a friend of the hermit, found Augustine's letter, together with some other writings by the same doctor, on an island in the Adriatic, and lost no time in sending it to its destination.

This certainly was enough to rouse a soul less ardent, and a writer less harassed by envy, or less surrounded by admirers quick to take alarm and even to be angered at all criticisms directed against their master; yet Jerome controlled himself and refrained from answering. He explained his silence in the letters which later he wrote to the Bishop of Hippo. It

seems that, although he unmistakably recognized Augustine's familiar style and manner of argument, the material evidences of authenticity were wanting. Besides which, the veteran soldier of orthodoxy shrank from opening hostilities with a bishop of his own communion whom he had loved before even knowing him, and who had sought him in friendship; one, who already illustrious, was to continue his Scriptural works, and one in whom he gladly welcomed a legitimate heir.

When at last Augustine heard of the pain his letters, divulged in such an unaccountable manner, had caused in the solitude of Bethlehem, he wrote to Jerome: "A rumor has reached me which I have difficulty in believing, yet why should I not mention it to you? It has been reported to me that some brothers, I know not whom, have given you to understand that I have written a book against you, and that I have sent it to Rome. Rest assured that this is false; God is witness that I have written no book against you" (the book in question was the letter, or letters, of which Jerome's enemies had taken a perfidious advantage). "If there be anything in my works contrary to your views, know or believe that it was written not to antagonize you, but to explain what seemed to me the truth. Point out to me anything in my writings which could offend you; I will receive your counsels as from one brother to another, glad to make any corrections, glad also of such a token of your affection. I ask and entreat this of you." Then followed one of those effusions in which Augustine's soul so often found its outlet. "Oh, why, if I may not live with you, may I not at least live in your vicinity, and hold sweet and frequent intercourse with you. But since that has not been granted me, consent at least to uphold and draw closer the ties which render us present to one another in the Lord; disdain not the letters which I will sometimes write you." [Ep. ci. Augustini ad Hieronymum, 2, 3.]

Sincere and touching as were the tones of this letter, it failed to disarm Jerome, who did not think it sufficiently explicit. Moreover the advice, and even the appeals, which it contained offended the somewhat proud susceptibility of

the aged Biblical student. After evincing his doubts, which we have already mentioned, upon the authenticity of Augustine's letter, he proceeded to add these words: "God forbid that I should dare to censure the works of your Beatitude; let it suffice me to defend my own, without criticising those of others. Your wisdom knows full well that every man is wedded to his own opinion, and that it were childish boasting to imitate the youths of old who, by slandering famous men, sought to become famous themselves. Neither am I foolish enough to be offended by the divergences which exist between your explanation and mine. You yourself are not hurt at my holding different opinions. But where our friends have really the right to reprove us is when not perceiving our own wallet, as Persius says, we look at that of another.

"I have still one thing to ask of you, which is that you should love one who loves you, and that being young, you challenge not an aged man upon the battlefield of the Scriptures. We too have had our day, and we have run our race to the best of our abilities, and now that it has come to be your turn to do likewise, and that you are making great strides, we have a right to rest. To follow your example in quoting the poets, remember Dares and Entellus, think also of the proverb which says, 'As the ox grows weary he plants his foot more firmly.' I dictate these lines with sadness; would to God I might embrace you, and that in brotherly intercourse we might have instructed one another. . . . Think of me, saintly and venerable pontiff! See how much I love you, I who, although challenged, have been unwilling to reply, and who do not yet resign myself to ascribe to you what in another I should blame."

To this letter, which was brought him by the subdeacon Asterius, Augustine made a modest and touching answer. He vindicated himself of having, so to speak, defied the aged athlete upon the field of the Scriptures, and merely asked to be enlightened. "Far be it from me that I should take offence, if by sound reasons you will and can prove to me that you understand the Epistle to the Galatians or any other like part of the Scriptures better than I. Far from resenting it, I

should deem it a privilege to be instructed or corrected by you. But, beloved brother, you would not think that your answer could have hurt me had you not thought that I had been the first to wound you. My best course is to acknowledge my fault, and to confess that I offended you in writing that letter which I cannot disown. If I offended you, I conjure you by the meekness of Jesus Christ do not render me evil for evil by offending me in your turn. Now, to dissimulate what you find to alter or correct in my writings or my discourses would be to offend me. . . . Reprove me with charity if you deem me in the wrong, innocent though I may be, or treat me with the tenderness of a father if you think me worthy of your affection. . . . Innocent, I will receive your reproaches in a spirit of gratitude; guilty, I will acknowledge both your benevolence and my own error."

The unbiased judge of this controversy must feel that St. Augustine was entirely right in his criticism and that Augustine's magnanimity and meekness prevented a bitter controversy. St. Jerome manifests here that sensitiveness to criticism which was a prominent characteristic in him. Jerome died at Bethlehem, according to the Chronicle of Prosper, in the year 420, and was interred close to the Grotto of the Nativity of Our Saviour. His body was afterwards brought to the Church of St. Maria Maggiore in Rome.

His sanctity and austerity is of the kind that awes rather than attracts, and is provocative of admiration rather than of imitation. For this reason he has been looked at with cool, temperate eyes; and since, moreover, he has so fully written himself down for us, there is little difficulty in discerning the broad outlines of his personality.

A strange, strong man, strenuous and intense even to the verge of ferocity, as was the fashion of his day with the champions of orthodoxy. In him is exemplified the sort of antagonism that exists between delicacy of perception and strength of execution, and renders their equal development so rare in one and the same character. With great capacity in both directions, St. Jerome seems alternately to sacrifice one of these interests to the other. In his zealous self-hatred it never occurred to him apparently that the difficulties he

was contending with were more probably the effect of mental strain and nervous exhaustion than of an overplus of animal energy, and therefore were rather augmented than alleviated by his violent methods. In the feverish vision of his judgment before Christ's tribunal—embodying no doubt the state of his conscience at the time—the whole apparatus of secular learning by which he himself was subsequently enabled to become so acute an exponent and defender of the faith, and which the later Church blessed, sanctified, and consecrated to the service of religion, was condemned without qualification as repugnant to Christianity; even as the body and all natural affections were indiscriminately condemned as inimical to virtue and sanctity.

It is mainly to the gigantic force of his intellect, to his stupenduous power of work, to his prodigious scholarship—as scholarship went in those days—that he owes his prominence in the history of Christianity. When we think of what he did, and did single-handed, for Scriptural criticism and exegesis: how he created order and coherence where previously there had been wild chaos and confusion, how he expanded and applied the critical principles then in vogue as far as the material to hand would permit we cannot help wondering what he would do, what he would be allowed to do, were he among us now, and were he master—as doubtless he would be—of the rich harvest of learning and information that has been accumulating during the intervening centuries.

Jerome's attitude towards the deuterocanonical books was not consistent. At times he bitterly attacks them, as in the following passages.

In his celebrated Prologus Galeatus, after the enumeration of the protocanonical books, he continues: "Whatever is outside of these is to be placed among the Apocrypha. Therefore the Wisdom which is commonly ascribed to Solomon, and the book of Jesus the son of Sirach, Judith, Tobias, and Pastor are not in the Canon. The first Book of Maccabees I found in Hebrew, the second is originally Greek, as appears from the diction."

Again in the Preface to Ezra: "What is not received by them, (the Hebrews) and what is not of the twenty-four

no place with the Hebrews, and that they needed not to respond to Porphyrius in defense of those things to which the Holy Scriptures gave no authority."

In his prologue to Jeremiah he declares that he has omitted the book of Baruch, and the pseudepigraphic Epistle of Jeremiah, "setting at naught the rage of his calumniators." We have no wish to minimize Jerome's opposition to the deuterocanonical books. At times it was pronounced and violent. But he could, at most, only be termed a violent doubter. He never was calm and constant in his rejection of those books. The fact that, in such strange opposition, he was at variance with all his contemporaries, made him waver, and *we find more quotations from deuterocanonical Scripture in Jerome, than in any other writer yet quoted*. Oft when opposed by his adversaries for his Scriptural views he vented his resentment upon the books themselves. Then, when asked by a friend, he would calmly discuss the merits of these same writings. He translated Tobias from the Chaldaic at the instance of Chromatius and Heliodorus, the bishops, "judging it better to displease the Pharisees, in order to grant the requests of the bishops." Praef. in Lib. Tob.

In Jerome's mind there was ever a conflict between two principles. By conviction and education he was a Christian, moulded by Christian tradition. His higher studies had made him in a certain sense a Jew. The weird quaint beauty of the Hebrew tongue, the deeper insight into the substance of the Old Law which only Hebraists can have, the conviction that of all the Christian writers of his time, he alone knew Hebrew, made him look with disfavor upon the books which the Jews rejected. It is an evidence in favor of the deuterocanonical books that they retained their place in the list of Scripture after the many tests to which they were subjected. The genius of Jerome was not able to draw even one Father to entertain his views on the deuterocanonical works. He fluctuated between his reverence for the Christian tradition, and his respect for the Synagogue till his death, and contradicted himself many times in his views on the books in question.

Dan. XIII. 61

"Et consurrexerunt adversus duos presbyteros (conviceratenim eos Daniel ex ore suo falsum dixisse testimonium) feceruntque eis sicut male egerant adversus proximum."

Dan. XIV. 35

"Et apprehendit eum Angelus Domini in vertice ejus, et portavit eum capillo capitis sui, posuitque eum in Babylone supra lacum in impetu spiritus sui."

Sap. I. 11.

"Custodite ergo vos a murmuratione, que nihil prodest, et a detractatione parcite linguae, quoniam sermo obscurus in vacuum non ibit: os autem, quod mentitur, occidit animam."

Sap. VI. 7.

"Exiguo enim conceditur misericordia; potentes autem potenter tormenta patientur."

Dan. XIII. 51.

"Et dixit ad eos Daniel; Separate illos ab invicem procul, et dijudicabo eos."

Judith XII. 10.

"—et percussit bis in cervicem, et abscidit caput ejus, et abstulit conopeum ejus a columnis, evolvit corpus ejus truncum etc.

St. Jerome, Epist. I. 9.

"Nunc Susanna nobilis fide omnium subeat mentibus, quæ iniquo damnata iudicio, Spiritu Sancto puerum replente, salvata est. Ecce non dispar in utraque misericordia Domini. Illa liberata per iudicem, ne iret ad gladium; hæc a iudice damnata, absoluta per gladium est."

Epist. III. 1.

"O si nunc mihi Dominus Jesus Christus. . . . Habacuc ad Daniele translationem concederet!"

Epist. XIV. 6.

"Os autem quod mentitur occidit animam."

Ibid. 9

"Potenter potentes tormenta patientur."

Ibid.

"Presbyteros puer Daniel judicat."

Epist. XXII. 21.

"Tunc Holofernus caput Judith continens amputavit."